1942
364
I163i

ILLINOIS PAROLE LAW

Accomplishments, Statistical Data, Papers and Addresses on Its Provisions and Its Administration

After Care of Prisoners Released on Parole

CRIME SURVEY

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
STATE OF ILLINOIS

Return this book on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below. A charge is made on all overdue books.

University of Illinois Library

MAR 16 1950

Apr 6

JUN -3 1950

JAN 31 1953

JAN 15 1959

MAY 28 1963

APR 17 1964

M32

ILLINOIS PAROLE LAW

Accomplishments, Statistical Data, Papers
and Addresses on Its Provisions
and Its Administration

After Care of Prisoners Released on Parole

CRIME SURVEY

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
STATE OF ILLINOIS

CONTENTS

PAROLE LAW—ITS ACCOMPLISHMENTS, by Will Colvin, Superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles — Pages 5-16

THE ILLINOIS PAROLE LAW, by Senator James J. Barbour — 17-25

THE ILLINOIS IDEA, by John L. Whitman, Superintendent of Prisons — 26-30

AFTER CARE, by Will Colvin, Superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles — 31-39

JUVENILE AND ADULT OFFENDERS, by Honorable Hugh Pam, Judge of the Superior Court of Cook County — 40-48

METHODS AND RESULTS OF ADMINISTRATION, by John L. Whitman, Superintendent of Prisons — 49-56

HAMILTON CLUB ADDRESSES:

PRISON MANAGEMENT AND PAROLE, by John L. Whitman, Superintendent of Prisons — 57-63

THE PAROLE LAW AND ITS ADMINISTRATION, by J. E. McClure, Assistant Director of the Department of Public Welfare — 63-71

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES CONTRIBUTED BY MR. WHITMAN — 72-81

ENDORSEMENTS OF THE PAROLE LAW AND ITS ADMINISTRATION:

By Illinois State's Attorneys' Association — 82

By the Chicago Crime Commission — 83

OPEN LETTER TO ILLINOIS STATE'S ATTORNEYS — 85-86

FIRST YEAR OF CO-OPERATION—Between Parole Authorities and Chicago Police — 87-88

THE CRIME WAVE—Survey of down-state conditions in 1920 compared with former years — 90-98

INTRODUCTORY

History reveals that vast crime waves have followed great wars. After the Grecian wars large bands of bandits preyed upon the people. Suppression of crime then became an important problem. Similar conditions followed the Napoleanic wars and suppression of crime again occupied the attention of the people of that period. The depredations and crimes of the James and Younger brothers, and other like organizations of thieves of lesser notoriety, following the civil war, are yet fresh in the memory of many people.

Crime conditions in America and in other countries, following the world war, are no different than they were after other great wars in which people were taught to fight and kill.

Parole laws in the various states are not responsible for crimes which follow wars although they furnish a ready vehicle for attack by unthinking people. America's present day crime problems eventually must be met in a more intelligent way.

In the states of Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, six thousand dementia praecox cases already have been discovered among returned soldiers. Of this number not ten per cent are reclaimable. While the dementia praecox may not develop criminal tendencies his mental condition surely makes him irresponsible for the unexplainable offenses committed and for the things he may do.

Under ordinary conditions of life most of these six thousand young men, going the even tenor of their ways, would not have become dementia praecox cases. The mental strain of the war brought them to the breaking point.

In addition to the six thousand dementia praecox cases already discovered by the American Legion, there must be, also, thousands of border line cases in the three states mentioned and yet practically nothing is being done along an intelligent line for their welfare and that of the public. These young men and boys are not responsible for the things that produced their mental conditions. Parole laws are not responsible for the things they do.

Present day crime is not a parole problem. Consequently attacks upon parole laws will not better conditions. The problem must be met and solved in some other way.

In order that the public may know in a general way of the operation of the Illinois parole law and its accomplishments, it has been deemed advisable by the members of the Division of Pardons and Paroles to print this pamphlet.

WILL COLVIN, Superintendent.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE PAROLE LAW—ITS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

[By Will Colvin, Superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles]

Note: The following is the biennial report of the Superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles of the Department of Public Welfare of the State of Illinois, from September 30, 1918, to September 30, 1920.

War and the reconstruction period produced crime waves throughout the country without parallel. All large cities, from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the north to the south, have suffered during the past two years as never before from the commission of major crimes. With crime waves everywhere it does not seem possible that the administration of the parole law in Illinois could go forward—winning commendation from crime commissions, judges, prosecuting attorneys and police departments—and yet that is the record of accomplishment by the present Division of Pardons and Paroles during the two year biennium from September 30, 1918, to September 30, 1920.

In brief the Division of Pardons and Paroles calls attention to some of the more important accomplishments during the two years, as follows:

In after care and supervision of its prisoners upon parole Illinois has taken front rank, during the past two years, among the various states having parole laws.

Every person sent to a penal institution, except the life termer—and he is a small per cent of the total—must come out some day, either upon parole after serving a portion of his sentence or by discharge after the sentence is served in full. That being so the present Division of Pardons and Paroles has made a drive to release prisoners under the best possible conditions, securing the best job obtainable at the best possible wage, and keeping in daily touch with the prisoner through a thoroughly trained, organized and systematized parole department.

Result—Seven per cent of the total number paroled out of the Joliet penitentiary were returned during the two year biennium, September 30, 1918, to September 30, 1920, for parole violations, as against fifteen per cent returned to the same institution during the twenty-three years preceding this biennium.

In its drive for after care and close supervision of prisoners Illinois has attracted the attention of officials in other states doing similar work and at the Congress of the American Prison Association has received the commendation of other states, several of which have investigated the Illinois plan and are now putting similar plans into operation.

CO-OPERATION WITH COMMITTING AUTHORITIES

Accomplishments that are proving most satisfactory have followed the drive for co-operation between the committing authorities in the various counties and the state paroling authorities. Prior to the year 1918 the Illinois State's Attorneys' Association, in annual session, regularly condemned the parole law and its administration. In its 1919 session the State's Attorneys' Association not only commended the parole law but also paid high compliment to its administration. They again endorsed the law and its administration at its meeting held in Chicago in December, 1920.

Co-operation between the committing authorities, including the state's attorneys and trial judges, with the state paroling authorities has worked to the great good of the public welfare, even though little publicity has been given to the manner in which these public officials are meeting upon a common ground for the first time in many years; or in fact for the first time since the parole law went into effect in 1895. The Civil Administrative Code rearranged the administration of the parole law so as to make possible these improvements and betterments.

CO-OPERATION WITH POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Great good to the public welfare also has resulted from the co-operation established by the Division of Pardons and Paroles with police departments in the larger cities, including Chicago, Springfield, Peoria, East St.

Louis and Rock Island. Although their problems were the same the police department of the great city of Chicago and the state paroling authorities never met upon a common ground until two years ago. For more than twenty years the police system of handling human derelicts could only be expected to produce scores of professional criminals each year. Men going out of prison, as every prisoner must some day if he lives, either upon parole or with a sentence served in full, can now receive the friendly help and advice of the large police departments of Illinois cities. Men upon parole are no longer viciously arrested without cause and thrown into police stations. The drag net has been eliminated. Men upon parole who want to return to right living can succeed in Illinois with the help and assistance of the police, who, under co-operation with the Division of Pardons and Paroles know where paroled men work in the day time and where they sleep at night.

Some idea of the far reaching effect of accomplishments possible under co-operation with the police may be realized when attention is called to the fact that from eighty-eight to ninety per cent of the incoming population each year at the Joliet prison are first termers. They furnish the timber which can be reclaimed to society.

COMMENDATION BY CHICAGO CRIME COMMISSION

Accomplishments by the Division of Pardons and Paroles are best told, briefly, in the commendation by the Crime Commission of the Chicago Chamber of Commerce, published in the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, under date of November 1920, as follows:

"If all of our public servants functioned as conscientiously as the present Division of Pardons and Paroles there would be no need for the continued existence of the Chicago Crime Commission."

The Chicago Crime Commission has been doing effective work for two years. It is one body in Chicago which has no ulterior purpose to serve. Its sole object is to relieve crime conditions in that great city. The crime commission has carefully investigated the work of the Division of Pardons and Paroles and is fully familiar with its efforts to best serve the public good.

COMMENDATION BY ILLINOIS STATE'S ATTORNEYS' ASSOCIATION

For many years, prior to 1918, the Illinois State's Attorneys' Association regularly condemned the parole law. The Illinois State's Attorneys' Association, in annual session at Decatur in December 1919, commended the parole law and its administration in the following language:

The State's Attorneys' Association of Illinois, in annual convention assembled, having had under consideration the parole act of Illinois, declare,

First—That the records of the three penal institutions, Joliet, Chester, Pontiac, together with the records of the Division of Pardons and Paroles, disclose, under the operation of said act, a remarkably small percentage of paroled persons, who have, while on parole, been charged with the commission of new and other offenses, and sentenced thereunder to return.

Second—That the purpose and spirit of said act is wholesome and good, and its administration, as now conducted, has been, and is producing excellent results.

Be it, therefore, resolved, by the association that said parole act, be and the same is hereby endorsed and approved, and,

Be it further resolved, that the administration of said act under the direction and supervision of Will Colvin, Superintendent of Pardons and Paroles, and his associates, John L. Whitman, Superintendent of Prisons, and James E. McClure, Assistant Director, be and the same is, most heartily approved, and,

Be it further resolved, that this association will co-operate, in the fullest measure possible, with said administrative officials, in carrying on this important work.

OUT OF STATE PAROLE

In accordance with recommendations made by members of the Division of Pardons and Paroles the last general assembly enacted legislation under which it became possible, for the first time, to release persons back to their home states to do their paroles. Many persons from other states get into our penal institutions while temporarily in Illinois. For more than twenty years these persons were compelled to remain in Illinois when coming out of the penal institutions upon parole. The system was bad, worked many hardships and incidently was responsible for many failures while upon parole and the consequent result in later years of returning persons to prison for technical violations of parole by reason of leaving the state.

Under the new legislative enactment it has been possible, since July 1, 1919, to send 95 persons back to their home states to do their paroles. Of this number 29 were out of Joliet, 44 out of Chester and 22 out of the Pontiac reformatory. A rule of the division requires that the sponsor, upon an out of state parole, must be some public official. Without personal investigation of such sponsor the division assumes that any public official in another state, such as sheriff, state's attorney, judge, mayor or town marshal, is a fit and proper person to act as sponsor for the parolee. Great good to the public welfare has been possible of accomplishment through the out of state parole.

DEFINITE SENTENCE PAROLE

Operation of the Definite Sentence Parole Act of 1915 also reveals a remarkable record of accomplishment. From the time the definite sentence act went into effect until September 30, last, covering a period of five years, a total of 137 Joliet prisoners were beneficiaries under its provisions. Prior to its adoption definite sentences for murder, rape and kidnapping were not parolable. Of the 137 definite sentence cases paroled in the past five years from Joliet, eighty have received final discharges, fifty remain upon parole and are reporting, two have died, and five have failed. Of the five who have failed two are serving sentences in other institutions and three are at large. The five year definite sentence record is that 95.62 per cent of the total number paroled have made good.

Until the enactment of the definite sentence parole act prisoners serving definite sentences served their time in full, received a ten dollar bill at the door and were tossed back into society without a job and with little opportunity of securing employment without recommendations. Definite sentence parolees now receive the close after care and supervision given to persons serving indeterminate sentences when they are released upon parole.

Under the present after care given in Illinois no person goes upon parole until a suitable job has been obtained. Every sponsor is carefully investigated by the parole department to ascertain if he is a fit and proper person to act as sponsor for a parolee.

LIBERTY DEPENDS UPON UNDERSTANDING PAROLE CONDITIONS

Since July 1, 1919, a parole supervisor at Joliet, Chester and Pontiac gives careful instructions to the paroled prisoner relative to what his conduct must be and what is expected of him while upon parole. For many years prior thereto persons left the penal institutions of Illinois, their future liberty depending upon their observance of the parole conditions, without knowing or understanding those conditions. It is little wonder, in their ignorance and in the absence of instruction, that many failed, became violators and were returned. It costs the state approximately $250 a year to keep a prisoner. Violators serve from three to five years upon an average. It is far cheaper and the public welfare is far better served by the employment of officers, trained and equipped to aid prisoners in returning to civil life. Other states are yet suffering the laxity that prevailed in Illinois for more than twenty years. Likewise the federal parole, at this time, furnishes no instruction to the paroled prisoner as to what his or her conduct must be while upon parole.

INDETERMINATE AND DEFINITE SENTENCE

Human ingenuity has presented in later years but two forms of commitment of prisoners—the indeterminate and the definite sentence. The indeterminate sentence succeeded the definite sentence in Illinois July 1, 1895. Since that time practically all the states have adopted the indeterminate sentence. At the last two sessions of the American Prison Association, the Illinois praole law, as revised in 1919, has been characterized as the best parole law in operation in any of the states.

Under the definite sentence, when juries fixed the punishment, the average time served for all crimes, except murder, ran from one to two years. Prosecuting attorneys in the various counties did not have the facilities to ascertain whether the accused had served prior terms. In addition a prisoner's record could not be given to the jury unless the accused went upon the witness stand in his own defense. Consequently the second and third termer fared the same, at the hands of the jury, as the first offender.

Under the indeterminate sentence the state paroling authorities, while the prisoner is serving the minimum of his sentence—and no minimum is less than a year—have the opportunity of ascertaining the former record of convictions, not only in Illinois but in other states as well. As a result the repeated offenders, with prior records of one or two or more terms in Illinois or other states, are serving the long sentences, as the work is done by the present Division of Pardons and Paroles. During the last five years of the definite sentence—1890 to 1894 inclusive—juries gave the maximum in 17 commitments to the Joliet prison for the crimes of burglary, larceny and robbery. For the same crimes at Joliet the paroling authorities have passed 490 cases to the maximum since 1895, an average of 98 cases for each five years as against 17 by the juries. During the past five years 162 cases have been passed to the maximum, the average time being 8 years, 2 month and 6 days.

The following table compares the average time served by prisoners at Joliet during the last five years of definite sentences—1890 to 1894, inclusive —with the past five years under indeterminate sentences—1916 to 1920, inclusive:

	Average for 5 years definite sentence—1890 to 1894				Average for 5 years indeterminate sentence—1916 to 1920			
	Number Discharged	Years	Months	Days	Number Discharged	Years	Months	Days
Burglary	1483	1	7	21	479	2	7	8
Larceny	776	1	4	14	363	2	0	18
Robbery	286	1	9	6	260	2	10	1
Average for above cases	2545	1	6	28	1102	2	6	4
Second term inmates	392	2	-	27	172	3	10	21
Third or more terms	131	2	6	20	53	4	11	7

Note: For the five years 1890 to 1894, inclusive, under the definite sentence law, only 17 inmates were received with the maximum sentence for such crimes as burglary, larceny, robbery, etc., and the average time they served was 6 years, 7 months and 18 days.

For the five years, 1916 to 1920, inclusive, under the indeterminate sentence law, 162 inmates were passed to the maximum by the Division of Pardons and Paroles for such crimes as burglary, larceny, robbery, etc., and the average time being 8 years, 2 months and 6 days. In addition four cases of one year to life were passed to the maximum.

UNIFORMITY OF STATISTICAL RECORDS PRODUCES PAROLE DATA

Prior to July 1, 1917, practically no effort was made to keep uniform records in the penal institutions from which statistical data could be obtained covering more than individual institutions. The Civil Administrative Code, placing the penal institutions in the Department of Public Welfare, made it possible for the first time to establish at Joliet, Chester and Pontiac a uniform system of books and records.

The following table, covering the biennium, showing the number paroled from the two penal institutions and the reformatory, the number discharged, the number remaining upon parole, the number returned for violation, the number sent to prisons in other states, returned under new sentence, died while upon parole, defaulters at large subject to return, returned to foreign countries, and those who returned voluntarily, furnishes an interesting study in parole statistics:

	JOLIET		CHESTER		PONTIAC	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Served parole and given final discharge	222	35.92	171	35.77	290	40.12
Reporting on September 30, 1920	243	39.32	233	48.75	275	38.04
Returned for violation of parole agreement	46	7.45	14	2.92	56	7.73
Defaulters at large subject to return	72	11.65	51	10.67	47	6.50
Returned under new sentences	6	.97	1	.21	8	1.11
Sent to prisons in other states	7	1.13	2	.42	32	4.42
Died while on parole	6	.97	4	.84	8	1.11
Returned to foreign countries	16	2.59	2	.42	--	----
Returned voluntarily	--	----	--	----	7	.97
Total paroled during two years ending September 30, 1920	618	100.00	478	100.00	723	100.00

Out of 1819 prisoners paroled from the two penitentiaries and the reformatory, a total of 116 or 6.36 per cent have been returned, during the two year biennium, for violation of parole.

Out of a total of 1819 prisoners paroled from the two penitentiaries and the reformatory, a total of 172 have defaulted and are at large, subject to return. This is 9.45 per cent of the total number paroled who have technically failed during the two year biennium. These have not committed crimes, either in Illinois or elsewhere, or the Bertillon and finger print systems would have revealed their whereabouts to the institution from which they are wanted as parole violators.

Of the total number paroled from the two penitentiaries and the reformatory, during the biennium, 18 or .98 of one per cent died.

Out of the total number paroled during the biennium, from the three institutions, a total of 15 or .82 of one per cent were returned under new sentences for crimes committed while upon parole.

The record of paroles, prior to September 30, 1918, shows the following:

Joliet—Total number paroled 8933, of which 15.69 per cent were returned for violation of the parole agreement and 14.86 per cent are defaulters at large.

Chester—Total number paroled 7042, of which 9.06 per cent were returned for violation of the parole agreement and 14.24 per cent are defaulters at large.

Pontiac—Total number paroled 9521, of which 12.85 per cent were returned for violation of the parole agreement and 10.87 per cent are defaulters at large.

STATISTICAL COMPARISONS

The following statistical tables give a comparison of the 23 year record, 1895 to 1918, with the biennium from September, 1916, to September, 1918, and the biennium from September, 1918, to September, 1920.

TWENTY-THREE YEAR RECORD—1895 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918

	Paroled	Violated	Defaulters at large	Returned new sentence
Joliet	8933	15.69%	14.86%	2.67%
Chester	7042	9.06%	14.24%	1.56%
Pontiac	9521	12.85%	10.87%	1.77%
Total	25496			

TWO YEAR RECORDS—SEPTEMBER 30, 1916, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918

	Paroled	Violated	Defaulters at large	Returned new sentence
Joliet	1166	7.29%	10.04%	1.21%
Chester	1069	3.93%	4.71%	1.00%
Pontiac	1230	7.07%	3.90%	.97%
Total	3465			

TWO YEAR RECORDS—SEPTEMBER 30, 1918, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1920

	Paroled	Violated	Defaulters at large	Returned new sentence
Joliet	618	7.45%	11.65%	.97%
Chester	478	2.92%	10.67%	.21%
Pontiac	723	7.73%	6.50%	1.11%
Total	1819			

The record of paroles, for the biennium, September 30, 1918, to September 30, 1920, shows the following:

Joliet—Total number paroled 618, of which 7.45 per cent were returned for violation of the parole agreement and 11.65 per cent are defaulters at large.

Chester—Total number paroled 478, of which 2.92 per cent were returned for violation of the parole agreement and 10.67 per cent are defaulters at large.

Pontiac—Total number paroled 723, of which 7.73 per cent were returned for violation of the parole agreement and 6.50 per cent are defaulters at large.

Joliet—From the time the parole law went into effect, July 1, 1895, up to September 30, 1918, the total failures at Joliet, including those returned for violations and defaulters at large subject to return, were 30.55 per cent of the total number paroled. The record for the biennium from September 30, 1918, to September 30, 1920, at Joliet, shows that 19.10 per cent of the total number paroled have failed.

Chester—From the time the parole law went into effect, July 1, 1895, up to September 30, 1918, the total failures at Chester, including those returned for violations and defaulters at large subject to return, were 23.30 per cent of the total number paroled. The record for the biennium from September 30, 1918, to September 30, 1920, at Chester, shows that 14.01 per cent of the total number paroled have failed.

Pontiac—From December 1893, when the State Reform School was changed to the Illinois State Reformatory, the total number of failures, including those returned for violation of parole and defaulters at large subject to return, was 23.72 per cent of the total number paroled prior to September 30, 1918. The record for the biennium, from September 30, 1918, to September 30, 1920, shows that 14.23 per cent of the total number paroled have failed.

From these figures it may be readily ascertained that the record of the biennium is one of achievement and betterment over the total record for the 23 years preceeding the biennium. At each institution the number of defaulters at large has been greatly reduced as has also the number returned for violation of parole.

The following table shows the average length of time served by first or more term convicts who constitute the 618 released upon parole from Joliet during the biennium.

TERM SERVED	Number	Average time served		
		Years	months	days
First term convicts	447	2	7	26
Second term convicts	85	3	4	27
Third term convicts	20	4	7	23
Fourth term convicts	4	5	2	12
Fifth term convicts	1	4	3	24
Returned and re-paroled	61	3	11	29
Total	618			

Note: The average time served under Definite Sentence Law for all convicts discharged during the year ending June 30, 1895, was 1 year, 7 months and 11 days. In addition to the time served under the indeterminate sentence the prisoner must do at least one year upon parole and in many cases he is required to do two, three or four years upon parole.

The following table shows the number of first and more term convicts received at Joliet during the last five years and the per cent of each to the total number received:

	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920		
Average Daily Count	1748	1704	1656	1398	1565	Total	Per cent
First term convicts	451	455	410	382	484	2182	88.24
Second term convicts	41	47	40	52	35	215	8.70
Third term convicts	13	12	8	7	13	53	2.15
Fourth term convicts	5	3	1	2	3	14	.57
Fifth term convicts	4	--	1	2	--	7	.25
Sixth term convicts	1	--	1	--	--	2	.09
Total	515	517	461	445	535	2473	100.00

The following table of recommitments to Joliet reveals how the number of repeaters has gradually decreased since the parole law went into effect in July 1895:

Recommitments	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	Total	Pct.
From July 1, 1894, to June 30, 1895	113	36	13	5	2	169	17.58
Total number convicts received	----	----	----	----	----	961	----
Daily count	----	----	----	----	----	1677	----
From October 1, 1916, to September 30, 1917	47	12	3	----	----	62	12.00
Total number convicts received	----	----	----	----	----	517	----
Daily count	----	----	----	----	----	1616	----
From October 1, 1917, to September 30, 1918	40	8	1	1	1	51	11.06
Total number convicts received	----	----	----	----	----	461	----
Daily count	----	----	----	----	----	1350	----
From October 1, 1918, to September 30, 1919	52	7	2	2	----	63	14.16
Total number convicts received	----	----	----	----	----	445	----
Daily count	----	----	----	----	----	1454	----
From October 1, 1919, to September 30, 1920	35	13	3	----	----	51	9.53
Total number convicts received	----	----	----	----	----	535	----
Daily count	----	----	----	----	----	1601	----

During the year ending September 30, 1920, a total of 535 convicts were received at Joliet as against 961 received therein the year ending June 30, 1895, which was the last year of the definite sentence law. Twenty-five years ago 426 more prisoners were received in Joliet in one year than were received there last year.

CHICAGO OFFICE OF THE PAROLE DEPARTMENT

After care and close supervision while upon parole has produced an exceptional record in the Chicago office of the parole department. During the biennium there was a period of eight months in which no parolee from the Pontiac reformatory was arrested in Chicago. During nine months no parolee from Joliet was arrested in Chicago and for eighteen months no parolee from Chester was arrested in Chicago. To one who reads the Chicago newspapers this record seems unbelievable, but it is correct nevertheless.

An assistant chief parole agent, five other parole agents and five sergeants of police, assigned by the police department of the city of Chicago, now work out of the Chicago office. In addition to supervising the persons upon parole in Chicago, securing employment for them, transferring from one employer to another and doing the other routine work incident to after care while upon parole, daily visits are made by the parole agents in the Chicage office to the bureau of identification, detective bureau, county jail, state's attorney's office and the various courts.

Summarized, the work of the Chicago office during the biennium is told in the following:

	CHESTER JOLIET	PONTIAC
Received on parole	300	332
Discharged from parole	240	177
Returned for violation of parole	18	19
Returned on new sentence	7	8
Wanted for violation of parole	37	18
Died while on parole	4	1
Position obtained	770	509
Transfers made	458	278
Visits made by this district	4986	3840
Special investigation made	324	37
Arrested and returned form this district as escape	23	1
Placed in hospitals and various institutions for medical attention	45	12
Homes provided while on parole	33	15

Number of men handled on writs from all institutions	26
Number of men handled attending funerals of relatives from all institutions	18
Number of statements obtained from court, etc.	435
Number of court trials attended by officers	67

THE PAROLE ORGANIZATION

In order to facilitate the work of handling 1819 persons upon parole, who are scattered from one end of Illinois to the other, the state has been divided into ten parole districts, with a headquarters in each as follows:

First District, Chicago; second, Joliet; third, Rock Island; fourth, Pontiac; fifth, Lewistown; sixth, Paris; seventh, Springfield; eighth, East St. Louis; ninth, Mt. Vernon; and tenth, McLeansboro.

With specified counties comprising each district, a parole agent works from the headquarters in each district. The agent is in close communication with a parole supervisor at Joliet, Chester and Pontiac. At the individual institutions the parole supervisor handles the parole business from that institution and gives directions to the agents in the ten parole districts. Each night, when he concludes his work, the agent makes a pencil report and mails it to the parole supervisor, covering the number of men upon parole he has visited that day. In addition the agent makes a monthly report to each of the three institutions, covering the work with the men upon parole in his district from that particular institution.

In each district the parole agent handles all persons upon parole in that district from the three institutions. In this way his time is not occupied and taken up with travel from one end of the state to another, as it was under the system in vogue prior to the reorganization of the parole department, made possible by the adoption of the Civil Administrative Code.

No person is released upon parole until a sponsor and employment has been obtained for him. It is the duty of the parole agent to investigate the sponsor and ascertain whether he is a fit and proper person to take another person upon parole.

In order that the agent may have as full and complete an understanding as possible of the character of the parolee, he is furnished a card index covering the commitment and all other information which it is possible to put upon an index card to aid the agent in an intelligent supervision of the individual parolee. It is not infrequent that persons of low mentality must be released upon parole. In instances of this character the parole

agent is furnished with a duplicate copy of the report made by the mental health officer at the institution from which the man was paroled. This report sets out all the peculiar traits of character it has been possible for the mental health officer to discover in the parolee. It frequently advises the parole agent what he may expect from the parolee. With this advice the agent is enabled to guard against the particular trouble that originally caused the man to commit crime.

It is the duty of all parole agents, when visiting the county seats in the various counties, to call upon the state's attorney, circuit judges, police departments, and other public officials, and to advise with them relative to the men upon parole in that locality.

The Illinois plan for after care and supervision of its prisoners upon parole has attracted the attention of officials in other states, many of whom are putting like systems into operation.

CONFUSING THE TERMS "PROBATION" AND "PAROLE" WORKS DESTRUCTION

Despite every effort the members of the Division of Pardons and Paroles have been able to put forth, our work continues to suffer by reason of confusing the term "Probation" and "Parole." A glaring example of this has just occurred. Two boys, who were upon probation, appeared before Judge Landis, in the federal court in Chicago, charged with crimes committed while upon probation from a court. Judge Landis publicly criticized the system under which they had been released. The headlines in one of the great daily newspapers of Chicago said:

"LANDIS ASSAILS PAROLE LAW AS HE SENTENCES TWO."

Neither of the boys had served in a penal institution. The headline did the damage to the work which the members of the Division of Pardons and Paroles have attempted to do honestly, conscientiously and to the best of their ability. Writing to Governor Lowden, under date of November 29, 1920, Judge Landis said, among other things, concerning the newspaper stories:

> "I have not condemned the Illinois Parole Law, nor its administration by the board, since the Illinois parole board quit turning loose professional burglars several years ago.
>
> "I should like Mr. Christy and Mr. Colvin to know that the odium for these outrages belong to my judicial brethren."

In another letter, under date of December 8, 1920, addressed to Honorable Clarence F. Buck, of Monmouth, Judge Landis expresses the opinion that:

> "The working of the state parole board is better today than it ever was before, according to my observation."

The ordinary newspaper reporter knows nothing about the problems of parole as they relate to the public welfare and cares nothing about them. The efforts of conscientious men who have devoted many years of their lives to a close study of handling criminals can be destroyed by an irresponsible reporter and there is no recourse. Four years of unsuccessful effort to escape from the harm that results from confusion of the terms "probation" and "parole" makes me wonder whether it is worth while to continue the battle.

In its bulletin of January 1920, the committee on punishment and parole, of the Chicago Crime Commission, specifically calls attention to the fact that "Parole is many times quoted when the term probation should be used." The text of the report by the committee on punishment and paroles is as follows:

> "Your committee on punishment and parole reports that at various times members of this committee, in company with the operating director, have attended meetings of the Division of Pardons and Paroles at Springfield and Joliet, and that the operating director alone was instructed to attend a session at Menard. The hearing of the Earl Dear case was attended by the operating director as the

representative of the Chicago Crime Commission. The application for pardons or commutation of sentences in the cases of two murderers serving life sentences and two rapists serving fourteen year sentences were opposed formally by the vice-chairman and operating director on November 19, 1919. These cases, all of them with records of the greatest brutality, were being urged for favorable consideration by the friends of the prisoners and entirely ignored by representatives of prosecuting authorities. The commission, because of its information concerning these cases, was enabled to present illuminating data for consideration of the Division of Pardons and Paroles, with the result that recommendations were made to the governor that the petitions be not granted, recommendations in which the executive concurred.

"It is the belief of this committee that the present personnel of the division is beyond reproach and that their decisions are made after the gravest deliberation and for the best interests of society. That much of the condemnation applied to the parole system is unjust and is confused with the term 'probation. Paroles are granted only after a man has served his minimum sentence; whereas, probation is an act within the discretion of the court and was designed to protect the chance or first offender from the degradation of the felon's stripe. As it is now applied it is a farce. Men with criminal records, gunmen and old offenders are the beneficiaries of this law. Probation is not within the scope of this committee, rightfully coming under the observation of the committee on courts and is merely mentioned to differentiate as between probation and parole in order that it may be understood that parole is many times quoted when the term 'probation' should be used."

So long as newspapers, judges, state's attorneys, public officials, court officials, police officers, and persons generally use the term "parole" when "probation" is meant, there can only be an endless chain of confusion working in the public mind to the destruction of that good that is in the parole law.

ACTION ON PARDON APPLICATIONS

During the biennium the Division of Pardons and Paroles acted upon 404 applications for pardon or commutation of sentence. Of this number pardon or commutation was denied by the governor, upon the recommendation of the Division, in 313 cases.

Upon the recommendation of the division, Governor Lowden granted executive clemency in 91 cases. Of these three were commuted from the death penalty to life imprisonment; 41 were from the House of Correction; 18 were from Joliet; 16 were from Chester; 9 were from Pontiac; and 4 from county jails.

SIXTY-SEVEN NEW STATES' ATTORNEYS

For many years under the policy of the former Board of Pardons co-operation of judges and state's attorneys was not sought. Four years ago this policy was changed. The fullest co-operation between the committing authorities in the various counties and the state paroling authorities has produced an intelligent handling of the problems in which all public officials are equally interested. Betterments have been made possible of accomplishment.

In the election at the close of this biennium period new state's attorneys came into office in 67 of the 102 counties of Illinois. Every effort will be made, in the interest of the public welfare, to continue the co-operation with the newly elected officers.

INVITING THE THIEVES AND CRIMINALS OF THE WORLD TO CHICAGO

Seven years of close study of the pardon and parole work of Illinois has given the superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles some convictions relative to the causes which enable crime to flourish in the great

city of Chicago. With no desire to criticize any public official I cannot refrain from expressing the opinion that the policy which controlled the state's attorney's office during Mr. Hoyne's latter term—that of giving immunity to men already convicted of crime in return for testimony which convicted other persons—is to a very large degree responsible for crime conditions as they exist at this time in Chicago.

There is not one person in a thousand who, after conviction, would not avail himself of the opportunity to escape punishment by convicting another, if he was capable of telling a story upon another which would convict the other person.

The perniciousness of such a policy in any state's attorney's office does not at once become apparent. It has taken four years of such a policy to fully reveal the terrible results.

Police officers have traded places in the Joliet penitentiary with professional burglars and thieves under the system. While spending a year in the penitentiary the members of the so-called "million dollar burglary trust" framed the stories which took them out and put the police officer, who had caused their conviction, in their place.

When the members of the million dollar burglary trust came out of the penitentiary they at once resumed operations upon a larger and grander scale than before. Police officers may deny the assertion, but it is true, nevertheless, that the members of the burglary trust committed burglary after burglary, while officers who knew of their crimes feared to arrest them, because of the threat made with impunity, that "if you bother me I'll tell the state's attorney that I've been paying you graft." That was sufficient. The officer closed his eyes, turned his back and went the other way.

Chicago now is reaping the consequences. Thieves and criminals see and realize what an opportunity like this means to them sooner than anyone else. In effect the policy became an invitation to the criminals of the world to gather in Chicago. It will take a long, hard fight to drive them out.

Everyone realizes that there are dishonest men in every walk of life. There will always be some dishonest men in every large police department. Probably no human agency will ever change that condition. But that does not mean that the great bulk of a large police department are dishonest men

The public suffers from dishonest police officers but it suffers to a far greater extent when a condition arises under which great numbers of honest officers become afraid to do their full duty in the arrest, prosecution and conviction of criminals.

Mr. Hoyne's policy of taking the criminals out and putting police officers in their places, together with the bond evil, as it exists at this time, are, in the opinion of the superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles, the predominant causes of Chicago crime. In an interview, since his election to the office of state's attorney, Judge Crowe called attention to the fact that 4,000 people in Chicago are at large upon bond at this time.

THE ILLINOIS PAROLE LAW

[By Senator James J. Barbour.]

Note. This is an address delivered by Senator Barbour, President of the Illinois State Society of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, on December 30, 1920, before a joint session of that organization with the Illinois State's Attorneys' Association held in the city of Chicago.

The zero hour has struck in Illinois in the matter of respect for the courts, and faithful law and administrative officials, and reverence for law and a sane handling of the problems of crime and criminals.

The mob frenzy of alarmists shatters the structure that wisdom has been a quarter of a century in building, and chaos takes its place.

We read from day to day that nisi prius judges who enforce the constitutional right to the writ of habeas corpus, and supreme court judges who dare to hold election laws unconstitutional are to be impeached at the coming session of the legislature; that the attorney general, fearless in his enforcement of the Volstead Act, is to be indicted; that the right to supersedeas and bail in the supreme court upon good cause shown is an encouragement to crime, and should be abolished. The granting of a review on writ of error to prisoners condemned to death is the subject of disparaging comment just within the border line that saves from proceedings for contempt; policemen are to be promoted and granted salary raises as fast as they shoot down people in the streets, and the statutory right to parole and good time is to be suspended for at least one year.

GUN MEN AND STATE'S ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Peculiar as it may seem, the reign of the gun man and the professional criminal in Chicago has been coincident with lawlessness in the state's attorney's office in Cook county and the wholesale violation of every constitutional safeguard accorded the citizen. All of this had its beginning twelve years ago when the state's attorney ceased to run a law office, and embarked upon the business of conducting raids upon people in their homes and offices, seizing private papers, forcing confessions, granting immunity to felons and life long crooks as a reward for turning state's evidence, and more abhorrent than all, making the office a vehicle for promoting gubernatorial and mayoralty candidacies, and using it as a big weapon to aid in factional supremacy. The beginning of high handedness, not to say lawlessness, on the part of the prosecuting officers was coincident with gross election frauds in primaries where in one instance the then state's attorney, and in another, one of his assistants, were candidates for office. These frauds were perpetrated to punish these two gentlemen because they had dared to indict and had successfully prosecuted and imprisoned office holders of their own political faith who had been guilty of monstrous pay roll padding for their personal gain.

Men guilty of these election offenses were aided in their conspiracies by the powerful liquor interest who were anxious to aid in the defeat of this particular state's attorney as a punishment for commencing prosecutions against saloon keepers for violations against the state Sunday closing law.

The gross election frauds served their purpose. The fearless and law enforcing state's attorney was counted out. The beneficiary of the fraud established the new order of procedure.

The raid, the sweat box, the use of the stool pigeon and the immunity accomplices, the sensational attack on police officials who were too diligent in going after the professional criminal, and the play for the first page headline has superceded the honestly conducted trial work that accomplished old fashioned justice and made punishment certain rather than severe and occasional.

DEMORALIZATION IN HANDLING CRIME

By the way, ballot box frauds are now accepted as a matter of course, and anybody who questions the figures is set down as one who seeks to overthrow the "honest" expression of an independent, conscientious, discriminating and intelligent electorate. Apropos of the demoralization that has been wrought in the handling of crime by peculiar methods of the prosecuting officers, the superintendent of pardons and paroles in his report to Governor Lowden, says:

"Seven years of close study of the pardon and parole work of Illinois has given the superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles some convictions relative to the causes which enable crime to flourish in the great city of Chicago. With no desire to criticize any public official I cannot refrain from expressing the opinion that the policy which controlled the state's attorney's office during Mr. Hoyne's latter term—that of giving immunity to men already convicted of crime in return for testimony which convicted other persons—is to a very large degree responsible for crime conditions as they exist at this time in Chicago.

"There is not one person in a thousand who, after conviction, would not avail himself of the opportunity to escape punishment by convicting another, if he was capable of telling a story upon another which would convict the other person.

"The perniciousness of such a policy in any state's attorney's office does not at once become apparent. It has taken four years of such a policy to fully reveal the terrible results.

"Police officers have traded places in the Joliet penitentiary with professional burglars and thieves under the system. While spending a year in the penitentiary the members of the so-called 'million dollar burglary trust' framed the stories which took them out and put the police officer, who had caused their conviction, in their place.

"When the members of the million dollar burglary trust came out of the penitentiary they at once resumed operations upon a larger and grander scale than before. Police officers may deny the assertion, but it is true, nevertheless, that the members of the burglary trust committed burglary after burglary, while officers who knew of their crimes feared to arrest them, because of the threat made with impunity, that 'If you bother me I'll tell the state's attorney that I've been paying you graft.'—That was sufficient.—The officer closed his eyes, turned his back and went the other way.

"Chicago is now reaping the consequences. Thieves and criminals see and realize what an opportunity like this means to them sooner than anyone else. In effect the policy became an invitation to the criminals of the world to gather in Chicago. It will take a long, hard fight to drive them out.

"Everyone realizes that there are dishonest men in every walk of life. There will always be some dishonest men in every large police department. Probably no human agency will ever change that condition. But that does not mean the great bulk of a large police department are dishonest men.

"The public suffers from dishonest police officers but it suffers to a far greater extent when a condition arises under which great numbers of honest officers become afraid to do their full duty in the arrest, prosecution and conviction of criminals."

IMMUNITY TRADED FOR STATE'S EVIDENCE

The state's attorney of this county, who has just retired from office testified in a criminal case on trial here last May and boasted of this pernicious system of giving immunity in trade for state's evidence. He said:

"We handle all murder cases in the same manner. We try to get statements if we can from one man or another. When a man makes a statement, after he has made that statement, if he is willing to be a state witness and go through with it, we always tell him that we will do something for him, whatever it may be.

Q. "You don't make any secret about it do you, Mr. State's Attorney?"

A. "No, Sir."

Q. "These matters that you have said, it is the custom of your office of getting statements from parties, and if the statement is satisfactory, they remain a state witness and you try to get them off—that is a matter you have given publicity to?"

A. "Yes, certainly. There is a press bureau outside of my office where reporters are now and every hour of the day and night they come in and ask questions about every case. You know that"?

Q. "Yes."

A. "We answer questions."

Q. "It is a matter of public knowledge"?

A. "Yes."

The supreme court in its decision of the same case, on appeal, condemned the methods pursued by the state's attorney in forcing a confession in that case. The court says:

"We do not want to be understood, as approving the practice of taking into custody and detaining persons merely suspected of crime for the purpose of getting confessions from them. Such practice deserves the severest censure and has been repeatedly condemned by the courts of this country. In determining whether or not a confession was made voluntarily it is proper to take into consideration the fact of unlawful restraint. (People vs. Trybus, 219 N. Y. 18, 113 N. E. 538; 16 Corpus Juris, 719.) As we have said, plaintiff in error was questioned during the greater part of three days and four nights by the state's attorney, two of his assistants, his private secretary and several police officers. While we do not believe any physical force was used nor that direct threats or promises were made, there can be no doubt at all that the repeated questioning by these officers, like the constant dropping of water upon a rock, finally wore through Vinci's mental resolution of silence. Admittedly his refusal at first to answer incriminating questions gave evidence of a desire to make no statement. The examination was persisted in by turns until plaintiff in error finally yielded to the importunities of his questioners and gave answers which they sought. It seems clear to us that the accused became convinced that he was bound to make a statement to secure relief from the continuous questionings of those having him in charge, and under the circumstances we do not see how a confession thus obtained can be said to be voluntary."

And now, without further digression, let us proceed to a consideration of our present statutes in Illinois relating to criminal law and criminology.

PURPOSE OF THE PAROLE LAW

The parole law was adopted in Illinois and became operative July 1, 1895, not as a concession to criminals, nor upon the demand or suggestion of defending attorneys, or those who sought to obtain lighter punishments for unfortunates. Its purpose was, and the result has been, to give the state greater and more prolonged control over every person who should hereafter be sentenced and committed to a penal institution. It took away from the individual judge, or a motley jury, acting upon the limited information and restricted latitude permitted under the rules of evidence and the hurry of legal procedure, the right to impose a definite sentence, as an incident to a judgment and commitment to prison.

It deprived an over burdened state's attorney handling a crowded docket, of the power to trade with the prisoner, and swap a minimum sentence of a year for a plea of guilty.

It made it impossible for an untrained, inexpert aggregation of twelve men to compromise, frequently eleven with one, and sometimes otherwise, and render a verdict fixing a maximum punishment of a year for a felony.

It put an end to the practice of some judges of yielding to the secret importunities of the ward boss or precinct worker and imposing light punishments, as a matter of favor and pull, rather than as an act of justice or deserving mercy.

All of these evils exist to this day, in cases of minor offenses, of lesser grade than felonies, where the parole law does not operate or apply.

Statistics prove the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of the definite sen-

tence law, administered haphazard, by as many diverse units as there are separate judges and courts in the state.

In fact, these things that hinder and prevent the incarceration of persons guilty of criminal offenses have been accentuated by the chaotic working of the adult probation law. All of the defects and mistakes in the operation of the probation law are mistakenly, and frequently maliciously, charged to the parole board, and it seems a well nigh hopeless task to set right a public that seems unwilling to make a careful study of the situation.

Under the definite sentence law when the sentence had been served, the man was more or less abandoned. Nothing to do but to so comport himself as to keep out of the way of an irritated jailer, so as to be automatically ejected at the end of his term in the same condition in which he went in, except for the damage and ravage sustained by the lack of human contact with a welfare board of overseers charged with the business of present improvement and after care.

The immediate result of the first working of this parole law, which speaking off hand, doubled the average term of confinement in prison, was a protest from prisoners, defending attorneys, judges and in many instances even state's attorneys because of the refusal of the parole board to release prisoners at the expiration of eleven months.

When the prisoner appeared in court for trial, his lawyer told him, and sometimes the state's attorney and the judge acquiesced in the statement, that he probably would be released on parole at the expiration of eleven months.

The prisoner knew that juries refuse to, and never return a special verdict of guilty under a habitual criminal count, in those cases where the proof sustains the charge in the indictment that the defendant had been previously convicted of a felony. Twelve average men will not hit a man when he is down. They will punish him for the offense for which he is arrested, but will not add to that punishment simply because it has been shown that the man previously suffered punishment.

And so the defendant started to serve his sentence under the working of the parole law, expecting a release when the minimum was served. But he found that he had entered the penitentiary only to confront new judges, who began his trial all over again. Starting with the original evidence of guilt, plus the verdict of guilty, he finds the parole board has sought for and obtained information concerning his life history, his place of birth, parentage, schooling, industry or indolence, his police record, mental capacity, vicious habits or inclinations, plus his conduct in prison. The recommendations of the prosecuting witness, the judge, state's attorney, sometimes the local crime commission, and frequently the daily press and police officials, all of these formulated out of the presence of the accused, without submission to him for answer or comment, also go into the judgment scales and usually weigh against the probability of a minimum term.

In addition to all of these difficulties with which this prisoner, who already has served at least ten months, has to contend, he must be ready to present to the board the name and written undertaking of an employer who agrees to give the culprit a job and at pay that will be satisfactory to the parole board.

Is it any wonder that under this parole system the terms of imprisonment at once doubled, and that society had the additional safeguard of the parole period during which the released prisoner had to make stated reports, subject himself to the whim of the employer and so conduct himself generally that he would not be called back to the penitentiary for an extended sentence?

WHAT THE VIOLATION OF PAROLE MEANS

The critic of the parole system refuses not only to give it the credit of prolonging the incarceration of the defendant, but declines to acknowledge the great benefit that society as well as the parolee receives from the after care resulting from intensive observation and control by the parole agent

during the period of parole, which, contrary to the public understanding, is not limited to a period of one year, but occasionally runs as high as five years.

This matter of violation of parole agreement does not mean that the parolee has committed an additional criminal offense. He may only have broken his word, failed to keep employed, made improper use of his income, contracted a marriage without permission, left the state hoping for better employment, or failed to report to the parole agent, or, in the language of the day, been absent without leave.

The first criticism made of the parole law came from the defendants and their attorneys and relatives. The complaint was that the law was unfair in its workings; that the man was wholly at the mercy of a hard hearted board, an **ex parte** drum-head tribunal whose only limitation of action was the maximum sentence.

The supreme court in construing the law directly held that the sentence by the court was for the maximum term, subject to prior discharge as the parole board should see fit.

It was sometimes claimed that in cases where persons charged with murder were convicted of the lesser offense of manslaughter they were held in prison longer than if the jury had fixed a definite term of years for murder; and almost invariably the man sentenced to serve an indefinite term for manslaughter was held in confinement for a greater term than he would have been under the law which authorized the jury to fix the penalty. This was due to the fact that sentiment against imprisonment did not affect the board in its findings, and that from the intensive study of the convict the board was able to take into consideration many things which the safety of the community would lead them to prolong the term.

During the five years of service as an assistant state's attorney in Chicago, mostly from day to day in the court room (1904-1909), I heard public and private criticism of the parole system by judges and attorneys, even by some of the assistant state's attorneys, because the recommendations for minimum sentence made by the judges and the state's attorney were not being acted on.

An attempt was even made to secure legislation to make the law more beneficial to prisoners, and to provide that the court or jury should designate and fix the maximum term for which the defendant in each particular case could be held, the parole board to have the right to release sooner if they saw fit. But the proposed legislation was defeated.

BEGINNING OF ATTACKS ON PAROLE LAW

The public hue and cry against the parole law began with and was fanned into a flame by a defending lawyer active in politics and continually opposing the then state's attorney and subsequent governor in his own home political bailiwick. This lawyer was enraged because persons whom he had defended were held in the penitentiary longer than he thought they ought to be. He even felt that his clients were discriminated against because of personal resentment to him. He made a personal issue against the chairman of the Board of Pardons, and continually made him the subject of public attacks. This was all in the interest of the prisoners and represented a protest against the rigors of the law. The psychology of "knocking" increased this lawyer's following. Soon the police found that an easy way to account for their failure to prevent crime, and to punish it as well, was to assail the parole board. This defending lawyer critic afterwards became state's attorney, and hoped to be Illinois' governor. He continued his propaganda against the parole board, the members of which were the appointees of his political rival, the then governor. The result was that the idea became fixed in the mind of the uniformed public that the parole law had from the first been a failure in dealing with criminals and protecting the public and served to let criminals out, rather than to keep them in. Every person in any way identified with the administration of this law, from the governor down, and every humanitarian who approves of decent procedure and intelligent handling of prisons and prison work, and of those convicted

of crime and their families, must be prepared to be maligned and publicly censured so long as evil exists in the world and crimes are committed.

REFORMATORY FEATURES OF THE LAW

Thus far we have said nothing about the reformatory features of the law and its administration which has been cumulative in its growth and now represents the best thought and the most effective results obtaining anywhere in the United States. Under the Lowden administrative code the Department of Public Welfare has control of all charitable institutions, delinquents, defectives and diseased, as well as all criminals. They have trained expert workers, and the after care system of handling the parolees is the direct result of the placing of the welfare control with one department of the state government. Instead of relying upon the employer, who is to answer for the prisoner, supplemented by the efforts of a single parole agent for a large area, whose main work has been to follow up and apprehend known delinquents and parole violators, the representatives of the department themselves assume the duty of following up the parolee.

Under the former definite sentence system when a man's time had been served, he was given a ten dollar bill, a suit of clothes, a pair of shoes, and a hat, the make of all of which could be recognized by any policeman anywhere in the United States, and set adrift to shift for himself. He could not be taken back to the prison except after another trial upon another indictment and a conviction for a different offense. Often the poor fellow had an uphill fight at best. He had no intelligent supervision and encouragement, and it was easy for him to drift back into crime. And society meanwhile was in peril. From the inception of the working of the parole law, the actual period of confinement and punishment was supplemented by the parole period running from 11 months to 5 years or even to life. During the parole period the parolee, if he was to continue to be at large, had to so conduct himself with, or without, the aid of organizations making his problem a study, so that the parole board would not have the right to require him to return to the prison because of bad conduct, or carelessness, or neglect to make reports due to varying unfortunate circumstances. This right to force the return of the parolee to the prison for further punishment made the parole law three times as drastic as the definite sentence law, in that on top of doubling the period of original confinement, it placed a weapon in the hands of the state of inflicting additional punishment in the event of misbehavior after release.

But now in the work of rehabilitation of men and of creating values for society, the Department of Public Welfare has its agent meet the man as he leaves the door of the penitentiary and start him on a train for his destination. Arriving there, the welfare agent takes him from the train, installs him in his living quarters and sees that he at once enters upon the employment which has been previously obtained for him. The man is followed up and if the employment does not prove suitable, or if he cannot easily adjust himself to it, other work is found for him. And in addition to his being required to make reports at the office of the parole agent, the agent frequently calls on him and on his family and employers and acquaintances. Take a case in point, happening within the last thirty days—a colored man was released from Chester penitentiary, at Menard, Illinois. A man in Springfield agreed to give him employment, knowing that he was a convict. The parole agent at Menard took the man from the penitentiary and placed him on the train. When the man got off of the train at Springfield a parole agent met him there and took him to a colored boarding house or hotel. The hotel keeper, knowing that he was a parole convict, insisted on a guaranty of his board. The parole agent had no funds available for such an emergency. He induced the hotel keeper to keep the man over night, and the next day persuaded the employer after much difficulty, to guarantee the week's board and to reimburse himself out of the pay that would be coming to the man. He was induced to do this on the representation that the ten dollars that the man had would be almost wholly used up in purchasing two suits of overalls and other garments necessary for him to work in. That

colored man will have the friendly care of the state of Illinois during the parole period, and until such time that it will be demonstrated that he is in every way qualified for citizenship, and is trustworthy and law abiding.

PAROLE OUTSIDE OF ILLINOIS

The parole act has been enlarged so as to permit men who while temporarily in Illinois have committed crimes and been convicted, can at once be returned to their homes or elsewhere in other states and serve out their parole there. They are not permitted, however, to leave the state of Illinois unless satisfactory arrangements for supervision have been made with the authorities in the community in which they are permitted to go. Usually the sheriff, chief of police, mayor or a judge is the person applied to and designated as the person who is to be responsible for the good conduct of the parolee. It is gratifying that these public officials in various states have welcomed this responsibility, and cheerfully co-operated with our board, and commended the system.

Two-fifths of Illinois population is in Cook county and the board is continually endeavoring to adjust its work to the problems of the city. Two reasons actuate it. First, a desire to protect the city from persons who have in the past been guilty of crime, and, second, a desire to protect the parolee from the police dragnet and the many temptations and handicaps of city life. The result has been that up to within the last two or three weeks and for a period of more than a year the police department and the board have been in hearty accord. The police dragnet so far as parole convicts was concerned, had been done away with. The propaganda against the parole system had been suspended. No charges were made against the system where the facts did not sustain it. Several police officers were assigned to co-operate with and work out of the parole agent's office so that the police force itself were seeking to encourage and help the paroled man to re-establish himself.

What has been true of the workings in the city of Chicago, has been duplicated in other cities and counties throughout the state, and the state's attorneys of Illinois have themselves cheerfully aided in looking after the paroled man and seeing that he has had a fair chance to make good. The Chicago Crime Commission, through its operating director, has frequently sat with the board in many of its sessions at Joliet, Chester and Pontiac. This commission demands a high standard of performance and is a remorseless critic. Its recommendation, therefore, is the best evidence of the effectiveness of the board's efficiency. In an address by the operating director of the crime commission printed in the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, under date of November 1920, it is said:

> "If all of our public servants functioned as conscientiously as the present Division of Pardons and Paroles there would be no need for the continued existence of the Chicago Crime Commission."

Federal Judge Landis, writing to Governor Lowden under date of November 29, 1920, said among other things concerning certain newspaper stories:

> "I have not condemned the Illinois parole law, nor its administration by the board, since the Illinois parole board quit turning loose professional burglars several years ago.
>
> "I should like Mr. Christy and Mr. Colvin to know that the odium for these outrages belong to my judicial brethren."

And in another letter under date of December 8, 1920, addressed to Senator Clarence F. Buck, Judge Landis said:

> "The working of the state parole board is better today than it ever was before, according to my observation."

The State's Attorneys' Association in resolution adopted in the annual session at Decatur in December, 1919, recommended the parole law and its present administrators, pointing out that the records of the Division of Pardons and Paroles disclose a remarkable small percentage of parole prisoners who have while on parole been charged with new and other

offenses; and further sets forth "That the purpose and spirit of said act is wholesome and good, and its administration as now conducted, has been, and now is producing excellent results."

BEST OF ALL PAROLE LAWS

At the last two sessions of the American Prison Association, the Illinois parole law, as revised in 1919, has been characterized as the best parole law in operation in any of the states. And the fact is that following Illinois' action in 1895, practically all of the states have adopted the indeterminate sentence.

The members of the Division of Pardons and Paroles work under very depressing conditions. They conduct hearings and conferences behind prison walls for long hours each day where they come in contact mainly with the prisoners and their impoverished and despairing families. They must steel themselves against the moving appeals that are put forth by friends and relatives of those seeking discharge, and at the same time have to impress upon these people that the board has acted humanely and with manifest fairness. There is no commending or applauding gallery present and public recognition of merited service unselfishly performed is woefully lacking.

The actual result of the parole system clearly indicates that we must look elsewhere to discover the reasons for the evils complained of.

During the biennium ending September 30, 1920, there was a period of eight months in which no parolee from the Pontiac reformatory was arrested in Chicago. During nine months no parolee from Joliet was arrested in Chicago, and for eighteen months no parolee from Chester was arrested in Chicago.

During the last five years of the definite sentence—1890 to 1894, inclusive—juries gave the maximum in seventeen commitments to the Joliet prison for the crimes of burglary, larceny and robbery. For the same crimes at Joliet, the parole authorities have passed four hundred ninety cases with a maximum since 1895, an average of ninety-eight cases for each five years against seventeen by the juries. During the past five years one hundred sixty-two cases have been passed to the maximum, the average time being eight years, two months and six days. In addition, four cases of one year to life were passed to the maximum.

Out of 1819 prisoners paroled from the two penitentiaries, and the reformatory, in the biennium, a total of one hundred sixteen, or 6.36 per cent, have been returned for violation of parole. Only fifteen out of 1819 have been returned on new sentences. This is less than one per cent.

The most sensational and nonsensical suggestion thus far advanced is that the parole law be suspended for one year and that no one be discharged from the institutions for at least that period. Nothing as radical as this has occurred at any time in the world's history. Think of it! For an entire period of a year no inmate of a prison can be discharged. Sickness, reformation, the approach of death, solemn agreements entered into with the prisoners, in months or even years prior hereto are all to be diregarded. Out of over fifteen hundred inmates at Joliet it is assumed that there is not one person whom the representatives of the state are capable of wisely selecting for parole or discharge. Rewards for acts of heroism, superior good conduct or any other unusual or extraordinary conditions cannot be operative if such a plan is adopted, and its advocates of course, have no intention of substituting any other system for the parole law. The brain that conceived such a suggestion is capable of, in good faith, advocating complete extinction of persons convicted of crime and harking back to the period in England when more than two hundred offenses were punishable with death.

SWIFT AND IMPARTIAL JUSTICE

Many well disposed associations of citizens in our state are insisting on drastic and uniformly increased punishment for criminal offenses. While there is urgent need at all times that the public should insist on swift and impartial apprehension and trial of those supposed to be guilty of infrac-

tions of law and speedy punishment of those convicted, yet it must be remembered that the obligation of the state, instead of ending, is just beginning when these things have been accomplished.

The four thousand inmates of state penal institutions, as well as the hundreds of others in jails, work houses and juvenile homes, constitute a certain measure of human values that must be worked over and rehabilitated and turned to good account to the full extent that the best method and thought of an enlightened civilization can devise.

These wards of the state require medical observation and cure, educational and manual and industrial training, and moral reawakening, and they respond to expert and kindly directed efforts along these lines, fully as much as do the thousands of other unfortunates that we house in state hospitals for the insane, or the otherwise mentally weak or defective, the blind or diseased; all constituting a vast army more than twenty-five thousand in number that are under the direct control of the Department of Public Welfare of the state of Illinois. If any considerable number of this vast army can be rebuilt and made morally, physically, mentally and industrially fit to take their place in the world along with the common run of mankind, society has been the gainer and the result will be that crime will constantly decrease.

The unfortunate victims of heredity and environment, those who, for any reason, lose out in the great social struggle of this day and age, as well as all who are connected with them through kinship or friendly association, must be made to feel that these organizations of superior citizenship and the well to do have about them some humane attributes and a disposition to treat with the unfortunate classes on a basis of broad humanity. Otherwise, anarchy and chaos are the inevitable result. The achievements of twenty-five years of intensive work in penology must not be ruthlessly ignored and discarded, and the propaganda by inefficient, ignorant or graft taking public officials charged with law enforcement and the prevention of crime must give place to a wholesome co-operation with all governmental activities having to do with the establishment of high moral standards and a genuine observance of law and order.

THE ILLINOIS IDEA

[By John L. Whitman, Superintendent of Prisons]

Note: This is an article in which the Superintendent of Prisons of the State of Illinois describes the Progressive Merit System of prison administration which he has worked out and introduced in the penal institutions of this state.

The new prison in course of construction at Stateville is being built with special adaptations for the carrying out of the Progressive Merit System. It is conceded to be the "last word" in prison construction.

The Progressive Merit System has been devised with the particular end in view of preparing men incarcerated in the state correctional institutions for their release and return to society under the provisions of the Illinois state parole law.

A Progressive Merit System that prepares the prisoners for good citizenship and a prison construction that makes possible the necessary classification and healthful training, is the Illinois idea that is being carried out at Stateville, the site of the new institution which will soon take the place of the old Joliet penitentiary.

Illinois insists that prison management should not only concern itself with the safe and secure custody of prisoners, but also with giving such treatment and training while they are in prison as will make it possible to release them as fit subjects to return to society, no longer criminals or a menace to the community in which they may live.

Inasmuch as most of those committed to prison must, under the law, be returned to society after a period of a few years, it is in the interest of public welfare that the fact be recognized that the time spent in prison either makes men better or worse, and that they will be made worse unless with the aid of adequate prison construction, those charged with the responsibility of prison management, may have the opportunity to not only teach them habits of industry, but to instruct and train them to become dependable and capable of good citizenship.

The new prison, as it is being constructed, provides for safe and secure custody, and it also provides for the operation of the Progressive Merit System that gradually and systematically assists in the development of stable character.

It is no longer thought necessary or wise to build a cell house or cell houses for an entire prison population strong and secure enough to prevent by merely physical means, the escape of those classified as the most desperate, but rather to build a series of cell houses which provide a varying degree of restraint so that as progress is made the merit system and stable character develops, prisoners can gradually be placed more and more upon their own responsibility until it is demonstrated that they are capable of self-control. Then it can be reasonably expected that they will be better citizens than before commitment and safe to be released under the provisions of the law.

Close observation of men leaving prison justifies the conclusion that it is not conducive to good results to release men, even upon parole, direct from confinement in the ordinary cell, and from the usual prison regulations enforced to govern and control the most vicious or desperate class, and incidentally applied to the entire population.

It is found that without preparation before leaving prison, men cannot always adapt themselves to this sudden and decided change of condition, and assert themselves as good citizens. In reality, they are no better than when committed. Their experience in prison may have embittered them and consequently made them more of a menace to society than before.

Many have never known any other than the vicious side of life, and not having been instructed and given the correct viewpoint of life or trained while in prison, as they might be, they do not know how to use their suddenly acquired freedom except to resort to crime again, in spite of the fact that upon leaving prison they may have had a sincere desire to avoid re-

commitment to the prison. Because of their inexperience, they are unable to adapt themselves to right living, as they are expected to, so sooner or later the desire they had entertained becomes merely a determination not to be caught again, if with their distorted viewpoint of life they somewhat naturally drift back into crime. They are caught again, but perhaps not until much damage has been done.

Ninety percent of those committed to the state penitentiary at Joliet have never served time in a penal institution before, but probably their commitment there had been preceded by several years of reckless, vicious living that smothered all good inclinations. The Illinois idea in the construction of Stateville is to provide facilities to properly prepare them for release at the time when the law says they must or may go out and assume the rights and duties of citizenship. Prisoners should as a means of preparation for that time be instructed, trained, and their better inclinations aroused so that they will have not only a full realization of such a responsiblity, but will, with stable character, be capable of discharging any obligation they might be called upon to assume.

PRISON PLANS AND MERIT SYSTEM

In order to carry out this idea of prison management, the new prison at Stateville is planned and is being constructed with facilities that make it possible to produce good results along these lines. The new prison is located practically in the center of the 2200 acre tract of land. Sixty-four acres are enclosed within a wall thirty-two and a half feet high with observation towers at each corner. The ground space thus enclosed is effectively divided into four sections by covered passageways connecting the various buildings. The entire west end of this space is thus set apart as the industrial section. The only entrance to the prison besides the one through the administration building is the wagon and railroad gate which opens into the service yard of the industrial section.

The north-east quarter of the balance of space is occupied as a hospital section with buildings suitable for hospital purposes as well as psychopathic and research work, and open ground space for the recreation of convalescent patients as well as those under observation of the mental health officers.

Two other sections within the walled enclosure are known as number one and number two, and are for housing purposes. Section number three, also for housing purposes, occupies a space of fifteen acres just outside the east wall; this section is enclosed by an appropriate fence. The farm colony, some distance from the prison proper, is looked upon as section number four. Opportunity is thus provided for prisoners making progress under the rules and regulations adopted to govern the activities of the Progressive Merit System to advance gradually from section one to section four, which is the farm, where they may be looked upon as fit subjects for parole or release if they maintain their grades there a required length of time.

As indicated before, the housing facilities or rather what is generally known as cell houses, in these four sections, offer a varying degree of restraint which will be described in other paragraphs.

After new prisoners are received in the usual way in the administration building, their pictures and measurements are taken. They then go direct to the hospital section for examination by a physician and mental health officers. Some prisoners may be held for continued observation and treatment indefinitely, but ultimately, or as soon as the physician's reports on their physical and mental conditions indicate that they are fit subjects to be assigned to work, they are passed on to housing section number one where the Progressive Merit System starts to operate.

The mental and physical qualifications of each are taken into consideration and a work program is decided upon which in the judgment of a staff that operates the system, will be most conducive to a proper development of mind and body. The most radical difference between the new Illinois prison and all other modern institutions is in the design of the housing arrangements commonly called cell houses. Many other differences exist in the

general plan as well as in the details of design and construction, but the most pronounced departure from the usual practices of prison design is in the conditions and surroundings of the housing accommodations.

In the customary type of cell house, the combining of security with healthful surroundings seems not to have been very successfully done. Where efforts have been made to provide the utmost physical security, such as the old inside cell blocks of Sing Sing and Joliet, the cells have been far from healthful; on the contrary, all inside cell accommodations have been shown to be decidedly unhealthful.

Where efforts have been made to provide sunlight and air by the use of outside cells with windows, the impossibility of supervision has caused these more beneficial forms of buildings to be called unsafe, and in consequence, outside cells have not been generally adopted for penitentiary construction.

PROVIDES SECURITY AND HEALTHFUL CONDITIONS

The peculiarity of the design of the Illinois housing buildings provides both the security and the healthful cell or room. The building is circular and the complete interior of the cells, which are upon the outside wall or the circumference of the circle, is visible at all times from the central supervisory point at which a guard may be stationed. The complete and efficient supervision which this design affords removes all danger of providing a large outside window in every cell. It makes possible this privilege, so to speak, for the reason that opportunity does not exist for the prisoner to abuse it.

It very naturally follows that since the air supply and ventilation is now available through an outside window, it is no longer necessary to employ the use of the usual open bars as a prison cell. The front of the cell may be largely of glass, which arrangement provides, for the first time, the individuality and privacy of a room rather than the openness and publicity of a cage.

In view of the circular form of the housing buildings, and the fact that all cells radiate toward and face the central point, there is no incentive for an inmate to attempt escape in this direction as he would only expose himself to a precarious position, in full view of his attendants. This feature obviously renders unnecessary the usual prison bars of which all ordinary cell fronts are constructed. Unoffensive but strong doors of steel and glass are therefore used in the cell fronts of the new buildings.

Thus for the first time, an inmate has a room instead of a cage and his surroundings are capable of all the individuality he may be able to exercise. Each cell has its full quota of sunlight also. The sun shines directly into all of the windows on the east, west, and south positions of the circle, while a specially shaped skylight upon the roof of the building permits the sun to shine directly into the glass fronts of all the cells on the north side of the building.

These healthful surroundings, coupled with the utmost security, are descriptive of the design of the two units, having 248 cells each in the number one section, and the same type of building is largely used in the section number two division later described, although certain changes in actual cells or rooms provide for a varying degree of restraint commensurate with the progress of the prisoner.

The principle of efficient supervision is the keynote of the entire design of the prison and the elimination of unhealthful conditions, which were formerly supposed to be necessary for the sake of security, is what contributes most to the successful operation of the Progressive Merit System.

While in section number one, prisoners are kept under close supervision and are given no responsibilities. The cell houses in this section are the "strongholds" of the prison, the supervision exercised is intended to reveal the natural or vicious tendencies of each so as to enable the officials to decide upon the sort of treatment or training that will most likely promote habits of industry and tend toward the development of such character as permits of progress under the merit system.

Prisoners are advanced to section two when they have demonstrated their ability to assume some responsibilities or there is reasonable assurance that they will continue to progress through the system and gradually become more and more dependable.

Only when a prisoner has demonstrated his utter inability to progress and improve does he remain for any extended time or perhaps continuously in section one.

GRADUAL ADVANCEMENT UNDER THE SYSTEM

The varying degree of restraint which is such an important factor in preparing the subject for his re-entrance into society, is as pronounced in his surroundings as it is in the matter of his treatment and discipline. The cell houses of section two are therefore diversified in character. Provision is made for group cells, where those who would thrive best under association and companionship may have that privilege. The rooms vary in capacity, accommodating from three to six men, and the atmosphere of a prison cell is entirely eliminated.

A large percent of the prisoners are eligible, under the law, for a hearing before the Division of Pardons and Paroles when they have served one year. At that hearing the division decides upon the length of time each shall serve. Comparatively few are paroled. Those who are, have had opportunity under the Progressive Merit System, to prepare, so that they can readily adapt themselves to right living. Those who may be required by the division to serve a term of years, continue under training, and advance ultimately into section three, and then, possibly, into section four. The chances are that those who are required to serve a term of years are the ones who, for the final good of the community, as well as for their own future welfare, need an extended course of training to overcome the effects of a previous criminal career, which probably was the result of a lack of proper training at a time in life when it might have been the means of preventing such a career.

The Division of Pardons and Paroles, while considering all cases, has the benefit of the results of the operation of the Progressive Merit System, and the opportunity afforded by the type of construction of Stateville, to classify the prisoners according to their needs and abilities, and can, therefore, pass more intelligently upon them than ever before.

The buildings of section three resemble a college dormitory system in many respects. The general atmosphere and character of supervision at this period of the inmates' progress is still that of firmness but carrying with it a spirit of extreme fairness. The cottages themselves have both dormitories and rooms in about equal proportion. Each cottage houses fifteen men, and provides the necessary bath, toilet, and wardrobe facilities, together with a large day or living room. Twelve of these cottages, together with two central dining hall buildings compose the section three group.

This section gives prisoners a splendid opportunity to demonstrate their reliability as responsibilities are placed on them while they are yet under supervision and training. They learn how to adapt themselves to community life and respect the rights of others while enjoying their own rights as decent law-abiding men.

It may take several years for some prisoners to reach this point; but when they do, they will have had a training that will remove them from the class that are a menace to society; and their commitment to prison will have served a good purpose.

Section four—"the farmer's colony"—is another section of Stateville that is important, in that it furnishes prisoners an opportunity to make still further progress under the merit system.

Their work there is supervised as a farmer directs the work on a large farm (otherwise they are on their own responsibility) except that they are required to obey the rules of the place as they will be expected to obey the laws of the state when finally released.

It should be kept in mind that practically all who are committed to prison must be released, according to the statutes, after having served, either a short or long term of years, and consequently, much thought, attention, and effort should be given to the possibility of returning them to society as good citizens.

Illinois is doing this in the operation of the Progressive Merit System and the construction of Stateville.

AFTER CARE

[By Will Colvin, Superintendent of Division of Pardons and Paroles.]

Note: Years of experience in the administration of the parole law of the state of Illinois has brought to the Superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles of the Department of Public Welfare, the conviction that the essential feature of this law is the care and supervision of these wards of the state after they have been released upon parole. Accordingly he has worked out a system of "after care." At the forty-ninth annual conference of the American Prison Association held in New York City, October 20-24, 1919, this plan was presented by Mr. Colvin. It received close attention and was pronounced to be the most workable in operation in the various states of the Union, and has, since that time, been adopted by some of them.

Experience brings to me a realization that the real strength behind every parole lies in the care and supervision that is exercised over the parolee after being released from incarceration.

Throughout all the twenty-four years that a parole law has been in operation in Illinois, after care and supervision have been a farce and a joke.

In July, 1917, Illinois made a meager start towards giving the after care and supervision that all persons should have while upon parole. Throughout the years from 1895 to 1917 the great state of Illinois employed but nine parole agents to look after some 2,000 persons upon parole. Two of these agents worked out of Chester penitentiary, two worked out of the Pontiac reformatory and five worked out of the Joliet penitentiary. These nine parole agents up to July 1, 1917, worked under the direction of the warden of the individual institutions. I have actually seen a parole agent from each of the three institutions in the city of Springfield on the same day, each to visit a person upon parole from the institution that agent represented.

NOT ENOUGH PAROLE AGENTS

An insufficient number of agents in the first place spent their time in traveling about the state. One parole law in Illinois governs all its institutions. One agent could have looked after everybody upon parole in Springfield or Sangamon county and have saved the expense of travel and loss of time that might have been more profitably spent.

Chester and Pontiac, each had six to eight hundred persons upon parole scattered all over the state. Proper care and supervision of such a large number could not be given by the two agents employed at Chester and the two employed at Pontiac. The job was so big that they sank down under its weight. The result was that they did little more than sit at home and await orders from the warden to go here or there and return some person who had been arrested, usually in another state, for a violation of his or her parole.

The hundreds upon parole went for weeks and months and the months stretched into a year and more, expecting a parole agent to visit them. It is little wonder that many slipped and failed. It is little wonder that they drifted into other states and into other institutions, from which we are now returning them. It is not infrequent or unusual now to find a man returned to Chester or Joliet who has been gone from fifteen to twenty years. Many of them have told me, as I have come in contact with them in the past five years, that they never saw a parole agent during the time they were upon parole and that they did not know what was expected of them when paroled from the institution. I believe many are speaking honestly when they say they thought they had completed their paroles before they left the state.

PRESENT SYSTEM ADEQUATE

For the first time in its history Illinois now has a parole department that begins to assume adequate proportions for the after care and supervision of its unfortunates who go out of its penal institutions upon parole. The general assembly in the early part of 1919 gave the Division of Pardons

and Paroles twenty parole agents and an appropriation of $194,000.00 with which to pay salaries and traveling expenses. Under the new Civil Administrative Code, which became operative in Illinois in July, 1917, the conduct of all the charitable and penal institutions was placed under one management for the first time. More than one hundred individual boards and commissions were wiped out and to take their place came into being nine departments, one of which is the Department of Public Welfare. Instead of the penitentiaries at Joliet and Chester, the reformatory at Pontiac and industrial schools at St. Charles and Geneva being under the separate control of a board of managers or trustees for each, all are now directly managed by the Department of Public Welfare. The Civil Administrative Code made it possible to correlate and divide the prison work into proper classifications. The Division of Pardons and Paroles not only does the pardon and parole work of the state but it also directs the work of all the parole agents.

CARD INDEX EVERY INMATE

A card index has been made for every inmate in the penal institutions. When that inmate goes upon parole a duplicate of the card is made and placed in the county file. Eventually a card for every inmate from Joliet, Pontiac and Chester finds its place in the county file. When a parole agent covers a county the card index acts as an assignment to him. The index card tells him where the person is upon parole, the name of the sponsor, the place where the parolee is employed, something about the crime, and the character of the parolee.

Under the system which had been in vogue for many years it was necessary for the two parole agents working out of Chester for instance, to go to the institution, search around through the books and records, ascertain where the inmates were upon parole and if the parole agent was industrious enough he made a few pencil notes to guide him in calling upon a few of the parolees here and there.

There is a vast difference between that system and the one now so successfully in operation. With a specific assignment to see thirty or forty or more men upon parole in a county, some from the penitentiaries and some from the reformatory, an agent will see all of them and make a report.

EVERY PERSON ON PAROLE NEEDS HELP

It has been my experience that almost every person upon parole needs all the help and advice that can be given by the agent. Many persons upon parole are weak mentally. They become dissatisfied with conditions of employment. Possibly if paroled upon a farm they get the idea that they are mistreated because probably they don't get as much milk or as much meat as they think they should be given. They will suffer under their fancied or real wrongs, and sometimes the wrongs are real, for a period of time and they usually will leave their employment and their places of living unless a sensible agent reaches them in time and keeps them braced up. The most difficult period, I am convinced, is the first month or two that the person is upon parole. If he can weather the storm for thirty, sixty or ninety days the chance to do the parole successfully and readjust himself in right living is greatly bettered. The bulk of failures in Illinois, I am convinced, occur in the main, during the first few months after the person comes out of the institution.

TEN PAROLE DISTRICTS

Since the first of July of this year, with adequate facilities to do the real work of after care and supervision, the state has been divided into ten parole districts. District No. 1 includes the great city of Chicago and the counties lying adjacent to it. Some eight or ten counties comprise each of the other nine districts outside of Chicago. One agent is permanently assigned in each of the ten districts and that agent has a permanent headquarters in his individual district where he can quickly be reached either by mail, telephone or telegraph. The last general assembly

in Illinois also provided for the first time, what we term a parole supervisor for Joliet, Pontiac and Chester. The parole supervisor works continuously at the individual institution and he only looks after the parole work.

In the past four months we have been able to perfect a real organization in the parole department. There is a chief parole agent and an assistant chief parole agent. The latter has charge of the work in the Chicago district. In four months the organization has been so perfected that a complaint from the most remote part of the state is in the hands of the agent in the district it relates to within twenty-four or thirty-six hours. Under our new system we lose no time in getting after and investigating the reports and complaints that come to us.

PRESENT PAROLE AGENTS HIGH CLASS MEN

It gives me pleasure at this time to say a word about the character of the twenty agents now in the employe of the parole department. I doubt if a better class of men, taken as a whole, ever made up an organization. Our agents have been schooled and made proficient in the work they are doing. They understand what is expected of them by the Division of Pardons and Paroles. Every man in the parole department has a real interest in his work. Dealing in the lives and liberties of human beings develops a real interest. The men in the parole department in Illinois do not punch the time clock. They work early and late, night and day, Sunday and every day. I don't know why it should be so. It is explainable to me only by the deep interest they take in their work. The parole agent, unless he can be deeply interested in the problems that daily arise, is no good and of no force.

NEWSPAPERS "PLAY" THE EXCEPTION

The great city of Chicago and the great county of Cook have about two-fifths of the state's population. It is there that we have our greatest difficulties. Betterments and real accomplishments never savor of the sensational. In consequence all of the good work that may be done is of no interest to the great metropolitan press in the city of Chicago. The failures attract their attention. It is of no interest to the Chicago newspaper that ninety-men out of one hundred paroled are living upright lives. They give their attention to the eight or ten out of each one hundred paroled who fail and are either returned as parole violators or upon new sentences. Their interests lie more in the sensational stories than in the public welfare.

I want to give you an illustration of this. Since the first of July of this year the Division of Pardons and Paroles, working in co-operation with the police department of the city of Chicago, eliminated the drag net. The drag net was a system that could only be calculated to make real criminals every year out of some one hundred to two hundred persons who were trying to do a parole in Chicago. But that is of no interest to the Chicago newspapers. Although their problems were the same, for more than twenty years the paroling authorities of the state and the representatives of the police department in Chicago never so much as met upon a friendly ground or in conference. Early in the year 1919 the police department in the city of Chicago, which is presided over by Mr. John J. Garrity as chief, and the members of the Division of Pardons and Paroles, met upon a friendly ground and worked out a scheme of co-operation. The basis of that scheme is merely this: If any man is committing crime while upon parole the paroling authorities are as anxious to have him back in prison as the members of the police force are to send him back. If the man is making a real effort to live an upright life and readjust himself in society, under this scheme of co-operation, it is made the duty of all police officers in Chicago to assist him and give him the chance that he should have.

SUCCESSFUL CO-OPERATION

It has been a task of some magnitude to make men going upon parole understand and realize that they can and must look upon police officers as friends. I assume it has been a task of equal magnitude for Chief Garrity in Chicago to make the officers understand that men upon parole must

not wantonly be arrested and thrown into the jails merely upon suspicion. Similar co-operation to that which has been brought about in Chicago between the police and paroling authorities has been worked out with the police departments in the larger cities of Illinois, including Peoria, Springfield, Rock Island and East St. Louis. When men go upon parole in these towns they are required at once to call upon the chief of police. Some here may be skeptical as to the success of co-operation of this character. I was at the outset. But for ten months I have seen the result and know the accomplishments. The friendship of the chief of police to a man who is honestly making an effort to redeem himself while upon parole is the greatest help the parolee can have. So long as the chief of police knows where the parolee is working in the day time and sleeping at night, that parolee is safe not only from the drag net but also from the vicious tactics of many old time police officers, who believe there can be no good in any man coming out of prison.

In the Chicago office of the parole department six sergeants of police are assigned by Chief Garrity to assist the six parole agents. These six sergeants of police know where every man upon parole in the city of Chicago is employed in the day time and they know where he sleeps at night The man upon parole must be at his living place not later than 10 o'clock at night. If, in the opinion of the police department, the place of living is not conducive to the welfare of the parolee, he is required to move into quarters more suitable to his well being. With this close supervision men upon parole cannot commit crimes without being caught and in that lies protection to the men upon parole who want to do right. It has taken ten months of hard work, pounding and driving, to make men who are going out of Joliet prison into the city of Chicago to do their parole, understand the benefits of the new system. The six police sergeants assigned by Chief Garrity to assist the parole agents are real men. They are in sympathy with what we are trying to accomplish. The old system of arresting men upon parole without just cause has gone—it is my fervent wish—never to return.

DRAG NET ABOLISHED

Whenever a man upon parole is taken into custody and incarcerated in one of the police stations in the city of Chicago, the parole office is notified at once and investigation is made immediately; jointly by a parole agent and one of the sergeants of police. These officers jointly report the result of their investigation to Chief Garrity. If the parolee has been arrested without cause he is immediately released by orders of the chief and within a few hours is back at his work. Under the drag net which operated in Chicago for many years, it was not unusual for two hundred persons upon parole to be taken into custody in one night, "upon suspicion," but more frequently to appease a public clamor for the arrest of perpetrators of crimes. Often they were held for many days, finally being turned out without being booked or without a charge ever being placed against them upon the records.

Let me repeat that this great public good to the welfare of hundreds of human beings—the end of the drag net—is of no interest to the great press of the city of Chicago. But the fact that a municipal court judge in Chicago just the other day remarked from the bench, that the parole board ought to be censored for releasing the unfortunate who was then before him, was sufficient to get large black headlines in some of the Chicago newspapers. That unfortunate had served two years in the Pontiac reformatory. He had gone on parole early in the year 1918 and he had voluntarily joined the army in the defense of his country. In May of this year he returned and was before the great jurist sitting in the muncipal court of Chicago on a charge of vagrancy. He had not worked since his return and his discharge from the army. That was a heinous offense and the jurist sent him to the bridewell for ninety days for vagrancy. He criticized the parole board that released him. I can only say to the jurist that neither incarceration nor parole will make an industrious person out of the idler or possibly the mentally deficient.

Then on the 14th day of July, 1919, there came before the pardon board, sitting in Springfield, a young man who told a rather distressing story about the wrongful incarceration in the Chicago bridewell of a boy 20 years of age, upon a vagrancy charge. He stated the boy had been arrested by two new police officers. They took him to the municipal court and charged him with vagrancy. He said that because of the great grind of work in that big court with its thousands of cases to look after each year, there was not time to investigate the case. He said the word of the police officers was taken. He said the boy was not given an opportunity to send for his friends or relatives and it was impossible for him to show that he had bona fide employment as the manager of a business owned by one of his relatives. But, he said, "the boy is in the bridewell and we who are interested in him must come here and ask the governor for executive clemency and a pardon. Three months out there may be the ruination of him."

COOK COUNTY THE ONLY BATTLEGROUND

I inquired the name of the judge who had sent a boy to the bridewell for ninety days on a vagrancy charge without ascertaining all the facts and circumstances. I was not surprised when he named the same judge who only a few days before, in his eagerness for newspaper notoriety had criticized the parole of a boy out of Pontiac, who had served his country in France and whose offense now was in the fact that he had not worked since he came back in May of this year. We have these discouragements only in the great city of Chicago. In the 101 counties outside of Cook the parole law and its administration has the commendation of the people, public officials and the newspapers.

Possibly you wonder why I call attention to criticisms of the parole board. They are a part of the problem that goes hand and glove with after care and supervision. I speak of these as criticisms of the parole board. In reality they are criticisms of the work of the Division of Pardons and Paroles, which under the present form of state government handles all of the pardon and parole work, and which also has supervision at this time over all parolees and the parole agents who look after them.

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM DESIRED

Constructive criticism, in my judgment, always will work to the good of the public welfare. Destructive criticism can only produce the opposite result. Not satisfied with criticizing the parole board for releasing the vagrant then before him the eminent jurist in Chicago, if he is quoted correctly, concluded his newspaper interview by saying:

"What's the use of having police and courts if these men are paroled? Two policemen were killed the other day and in all probability if the murderers had been apprehended it would be found they had been upon parole."

Statements like these are destructive and always work to the harm of the public welfare. The eminent jurist, sitting in the municipal court of Chicago, had no more ground for suggesting that the two policemen were killed by paroled persons than I would have if I replied to him by saying the murderers were probably on probation from one of the municipal courts in Chicago. In matters like this at least my word is as good as his. In truth neither the learned judge nor myself has any right to destroy parole or probation by such unsupported statements.

During twenty years of my life spent in newspaper work criticisms such as those credited to the eminent judge would have been investigated before being given publicity. Times have changed in this regard. Not one of the newspapers that printed the alleged criticisms of the parole board made an effort either to investigate or to obtain the real facts. The harm lies in the fact the thousands of unthinking persons reading such things in the newspapers accept them as true. In that lies the destructiveness and the great harm to the good of the public welfare.

PAROLEE MUST HAVE SPONSOR

Under the present system no person is released upon parole until a sponsor has been thoroughly investigated, searched and approved. This is one

of the very important features of the work done by the parole agent. The proper sponsor can do a great deal toward helping the parolee to return to right living. Under the old system of selecting a sponsor, I have learned that it was not unusual for a convict who had gone out of prison a year or so before to become the sponsor for an associate or friend later being released on parole. No one will say that a former convict is a good sponsor for any person upon parole. A similiar thing is not likely to happen under the present plan which requires the sponsor to be carefully checked before it is determined that he is a fit person to take another person upon parole.

THE RIGHT KIND OF A JOB

Obtaining the right kind of a job for the parolee is another important feature. In many cases the employer must take the parolee without seeing him. Frequently the parole agent transfers a man four or five times before he locates him in a job that fits. When you can finally place a man in work that he likes to do his real chance to succeed is improved greatly. Many men going upon parole have old jobs to return to, many others were strangers in the state when they got into trouble which caused their incarceration and rarely have any friends. When the time comes for them to go upon the outside they must depend upon the parole department for a job. Our parole supervisors each month notify the parole agents in their various districts of the men who have been ordered paroled who do not have jobs to go to. In this notice the parole agent is advised as to the character of the man, his weight and age, his condition of health, and is given some idea of the different kinds of work the man is best fitted to do. It is not always possible to take a man right out of prison and put him in the job he is best fitted for. By using their senses and common judgment the parole agents keep transferring a man until he seems to be suitably located.

SUB-NORMAL PERSONS AND THE PAROLE LAW

I wish to mention here a new feature of the work which also is of great importance. Many men and boys get into the penitentiary and reformatory who are mentally deficient. Many are sub-normal. Persons of this class always are a hinderance and a liability. In my judgment the public welfare should provide some other means to care for them than through the parole law. It has been the custom for many years, not only in Illinois but in most all the other states, to send mentally deficient people to the penitentiary for the offense they commit. Incerceration will never make a new set of brains for them. In my individual opinion they need the care of a physician, specially trained, rather than incarceration. You cannot always keep in prison a person who has committed a small offense, merely because you suspect that his mentality is below normal. Two years ago the Department of Public Welfare in Illinois brought into being for the first time, the Division of Criminology. Doctor Herman M. Adler is at its head. Low or deficient mentality is no longer a suspicion.

Under the leadership of the Division of Criminology the persons in Illinois who are entrusted with the pardon and parole work of the state are making a drive for special treatment for the mentally deficient. We believe that real accomplishments can be attained through the scientific treatment of the deficients. Incarceration for one year or many years, it makes no difference which, in a penal institution will not cure the adult man or woman who has the mind of a child some nine or twelve years of age. Through all the years in the various states it has been the custom to incarcerate the mentally deficient for the small crimes they commit. I believe the time is close at hand in Illinois when the mentally deficient will be removed from the parole law to which they can never be anything but a liability. We who are entrusted with the parole work in Illinois, are suggesting state farms for the mentally deficient and the low grade moron. By placing them upon farms the state can make their condition comfortable. Physicians, specially trained for their work, are better fitted to determine when the moron is safe to go back into society than any membership of a parole board, having to do with the parole of criminals. I am convinced that thousands of persons daily walk the streets in the city of Chicago who,

because of their mentality are not fit to be at large. These are the persons who commit the terribly atrocious crimes. It is the custom not only in Illinois but elsewhere to send the boy of low mentality, who has only stolen a pair of shoes to the reformatory or the penitentiary upon a larceny or burglary charge. Under the customs which have been in vogue for many years some one to two or possibly three years incarceration is looked upon as sufficient for such a crime. Merely because the members of the parole board suspect that a boy or man, because of his mentality, might at some future time commit some terribly atrocious crime, is not sufficient reason to keep that person in custody always. No state is equipped with a sufficient number of institutions at this time to keep persons of this description incarcerated for long periods of time. And yet it is the person of his description who always becomes a great liability when released upon parole. If, out of the hundreds released with low mentality, one commits a serious or atrocious crime, a great hue and cry immediately goes up from the newspapers in that locality. Not one of these newspapers ever attempts to offer anything constructive which might tend to lessen the hazard and, incidentally, when someone comes forward offering constructive ideas or suggestion for legislation it is impossible to interest the same newspaper in support of the thing that seems to be for the public good.

Let me repeat these are among the problems you meet in the after care and supervision of persons upon parole. Possibly the next general assembly in Illinois, when it meets in January, 1921, will take a further advanced step and provide institutions properly designed and fitted for the care of these delinquents and deficients. We are making the drive for something along this line and we hope to succeed.

When the low grade or sub-normal fellow goes upon parole the parole agent is furnished with a copy of the criminologist's analysis of that person's case. The parole agent knows at once that the person he is looking after, while 26 or 36 years old, has the mind of a child, 8, 9, or 10 years of age. This information in the hands of the parole agent gives to him at once an understanding of the person he is handling that he could have obtained in no other way.

AT LEAST SIX MONTHS PAROLE

It has been the custom in Illinois for the past twenty years to get rid of the person upon parole at the earliest opportunity. The Illinois parole law requires at least six months upon parole. The rules governing the work requires one year upon parole. It seems to me the effort always has been to give a final discharge as quickly as possible. Under the new plans the mental deficients are placed upon parole now for two, three, four, or five years. We who are entrusted with the work believe that with proper care and supervision many of his class will be saved from new crimes and kept from returning under new sentences as second and third termers. In other words we do not believe that there is any real accomplishment toward the public welfare in a final discharge at the end of six months. Since the state has furnished the facilities to work with we are going to make the effort to provide supervision and after care for longer periods of time.

PAROLE SOME OUT OF STATE

Since the first of July 1919, we have been enabled in certain cases to parole persons outside the state. Many persons while transients in the great city of Chicago get into trouble that results in their incarceration. These people come from Michigan, Wisconsin, and Indiana. In other parts of the state they drift in over the bridges at Rock Island, East St. Louis and Cairo. Under the old system after serving the sentence in a penal institution they were tied in the state when they went on parole. A boy or young man might have parents within twenty miles of Chicago or just across the bridge at East St. Louis or just across the bridge at Rock Island, who were anxious to take him home and look after him. It was impossible to permit him to leave the state until the general assembly this year provided an amendment to the parole law. Possibly the parolee was a man with a fam-

ily in the adjacent state, dependent upon him for support, children suffering and wife destitute. Kept in Illinois he could only earn sufficient for his own upkeep. He could provide nothing for the suffering family and yet throughout all the years until the first of July 1919, the persons entrusted with the parole work were powerless to permit him to leave the confines of Illinois. Crossing an imaginary boundary line between Illinois and Indiana was a parole violation under the law. It is little wonder that many in their discouragement ran away and became defaulters at large. Under this amendment to the parole law now operative for the first time, matters of this kind can be handled with a degree of intelligence. Since the first of July 1919, under the amendment permitting parole outside the state, we have been enabled to permit many colored men to return to their homes in the south where the people understand their problems and are in sympathy with them. These men had been imported from the south by large employers of labor and had gotten in trouble that caused their incarceration. So long as they were tied in Illinois by the parole law they could only be a menace. Incapable of doing parole, many because of their mentality, they became what we call the "in and outer."

RESULTS SHOWN BY STATUTES

I am able to bring to this section of the American Prison Congress a concrete statistical illustration of what can be accomplished by after care and supervision. With the inadequate facilities at hand two years ago when the Division of Pardons and Paroles took over the work of handling the parole agents we made a start. We took the two parole agents then provided for Chester, the two provided for Pontiac, and the five provided for Joliet and put them into a compact organization. Our immediate problem was in Chicago and the northern part of the state. In consequence we used seven of the nine agents upon the Joliet and Pontiac work of supervision and after care.

At the Joliet institution the record is that 15.69 per cent of all who have been paroled during the twenty-three years have been returned as violators. The two-year record at Joliet shows that only 7.29 per cent have been returned as violators. The twenty-three-year record at Joliet shows that 14.86 per cent of the total number paroled are listed as defaulters at large. The two-year record shows only 10 per cent of the number paroled are listed as defaulters.

The twenty-three-year record at Pontiac shows 12.85 per cent of the total number paroled returned as violators. The two-year record at Pontiac is 7.07 per cent returned as violators. The defaulters at large for the twenty-three years is 10.87 per cent while for the two-year period the record is less than 4 per cent, or to be exact 3.90 per cent.

At Chester the twenty-three-year record shows that 9.06 per cent were returned as violators. The two-year record shows that 3.93 per cent of the total number paroled during that period were returned as violators. The twenty-three-year record at Chester shows that 14.24 of the total number paroled in that period of time are classed as defaulters at large. The two-year record shows that 4.71 per cent of the total number paroled in that period are defaulters subject to return.

THE PAROLE DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION

I want to briefly describe the close organization of the parole department as it is working at this time. Twenty parole agents tonight make a brief pencil report upon all parolees visited by them during the day. These reports are made upon blanks furnished the agents. One copy is mailed tonight to the institution and a carbon copy is mailed to the chief parole agent. These reports detail how each parolee is getting along. He may not be doing well. He may be slipping. Possibly the agent thinks it will be to the man's welfare to transfer him to another job. Possibly the agent has discovered that the sponsor has been mistreating the parolee. Whatever the agent learned upon visiting his men today is reported tonight. The daily report gets action from two sources—the parole supervisor at the

institution and the chief parole agent. If the parolee is missing the parole supervisor at once notifies every other agent, sending a picture, and the whole state is honey-combed by the agents in an effort to find the missing man.

At the end of the month the parole agent makes a monthly report, covering the number of persons upon parole in his district from the three institutions. This report shows among other things the number of men visited once, twice or more times during the month, those transferred by name and number, the reason for each transfer, the names and number of any who have violated and the character of violation, the number returned for violations and the number not returned; and closes with remarks and suggestions.

The agent's report fits into a monthly report made by the parole supervisors working at Joliet, Chester and Pontiac. The report by the supervisor has the attention of the Division of Pardons and Paroles when it sits in regular monthly session at the individual institution. At that time, after studying all this data, the Division of Pardons and Paroles gives specific directions to the supervisors as to what shall be done in each case that does not appear to be getting along satisfactorily. These orders in turn are transmitted to the parole agents by the supervisors.

POLITICS ABSENT

I have heard continuous reference to politics about these rooms and corridors while attending the sessions of the congress. In Illinois our work is not hindered by politics. The Department of Public Welfare has at its head a man well fitted and trained in big business. He is not a politician. Politics should have no place in the management of charitable, penal and correctional institutions. Elimination of politics in Illinois from these institutions has worked most admirably. "Determine the matters coming before the Division of Pardons and Paroles upon their merits alone," is the direction from Governor Lowden, and that is what we are doing. Our decisions and recommendations are based upon the merits of the case as we see them, and that is the only way our work can be successfully done.

STATES MUST CO-OPERATE

In conclusion permit me to suggest that the day is near at hand when states having parole laws must begin to co-operate. Upwards of two years ago I wrote to the various states operating under parole laws, suggesting that the Illinois parole department would gladly undertake the supervision of all persons coming into the state upon parole from other states. To some of these communications I received no answer. Others courteously acknowledged. Some said they would be glad to co-operate. But only one state—Ohio—has ever furnished the name of a person upon parole in Illinois. From time to time there are as many as 600 persons upon parole in Chicago from other states. I say 600 and I use these figures advisedly. Various charitable organizations in Chicago are sponsor for these men.

I know of no better place to suggest this co-operation among the states than in this division. There is a growing tendency to send the parolee to some other state and in that way be rid of him. The growing custom can only make trouble in the end. At this time different states are reaping the benefit of shipping the insane back and forth from one end of the country to the other. Scandals brewing. Dumping paroled men out of one state into another also will produce scandal, eventually. This is the time to stop the evil. I hope this section and this congress will be impressed with the real importance of what I am endeavoring to present and take some action that is calculated to correct the growing custom before harm is done.

THE JUVENILE AND ADULT OFFENDERS

[By Hon. Hugo Pam, Judge of the Superior Court of Cook County.]

Note: The following address was delivered by Judge Pam as President of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology at the 1919 meeting of the institute held in Boston. It was later repeated before the Illinois State Conference of Charities held at Decatur. In the latter presentation, Judge Pam added in the strongest possible terms his appreciation of the Illinois parole law and praised the courage and spirit of the men who are administering it. He made an eloquent plea for the law itself and asked the support of the pubic to back the Division of Pardons and Paroles in their interpretations of its provisions.

Last year saw the ending of the war. From England, from France, and in our own country, statistics have been gathered which show that serious crime which had been on the decrease during the period of the war was again stalking in the foreground. No longer did the activity of the war serve as a release of those elementary passions and pent-up energies which in the case of many men, unless directed into proper channels, lead to the commission of acts either criminal or of such violence and force that unless curbed and restrainced lead to acts of crime.

In many sections of our country the form of violence was in the nature of race riots; in others, industrial disturbances. All engaged therein were not criminals, but these occasions were taken advantage of by the worst elements of society to give vent to its inclination to lawlessness and disregard of the rights of the community.

The newspapers are filled with accounts of crimes of such daring and boldness as to make the average citizen stand aghast at the manner in which the security of life and rights of property are ruthlessly disregarded and imperiled.

THE ROLE OF THE AUTOMOBILE IN CRIME

A forceful element in the character of crime has been the advent of the automobile. Formerly, in the days following the civil war, and up to the nineties, the horse was the quickest means of getting to and away from the scene of crime. Today, the automobile changes this—makes possible a quick advance and a quick getaway. Before an alarm can be sounded, all trace of the culprits usually has disappeared and their escape practically assured. While in many instances criminals have been apprehended, there are many others where no capture was effected. The boldness of the crime and the apparent helplessness of the law to apprehend the perpetrators have embittered the public to the extent that any advance in the treatment of the criminal is looked upon with disfavor. In addition, those having charge of prosecutions, namely, the state's attorneys and the officers, have repeatedly charged that in the main these serious crimes have been committed by persons either on parole or probation, and have often, without justification, declared that these humane provisions of the law had been abused and should be either curtailed in their application or entirely repealed.

Such opinion has also received support by our daily press, both in its news columns and in its editorials, all of which inflames the public mind and arouses a feeling of resentment against any legislation which has for its purpose anything else but the physical punishment of the criminal.

AVERAGE MAN FEELS HE IS LAW-ABIDING

The average individual feels that he is law-abiding and that his rights have been invaded. He does not stop to ask himself whether he or society is in any way responsible, but goes upon the presumption that the individual alone is at fault, and therefore has entirely forfeited his rights to the protection of society. The community does not realize that often these crimes but evidence the condition which itself has helped bring about, and therefore does not sympathize with an institution or group of men or women who attempt to bring this fact home.

At the present time this feeling in the community is in ascendancy, and therefore members of our institute should work the harder, not only to prevent enactment of reactionary legislation, but to bring about a better understanding in the community of the real causes that lie at the root of the present day criminal conditions.

While it is not possible within the limited space of time that I have to address you to cover this entire subject matter, I do wish to present my views upon two phases of this question.

First, the juvenile in relation to crime, which subject can be divided into two heads.

TWO PHASES OF THE QUESTION

(a) Those who are subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, namely, children up to the age of seventeen;

(b) Those between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five.

As to the juvenile offender: The juvenile offender has been the beneficiary in recent years of special legislation throughout nearly all the states of our country. The purpose of the laws is salutary, and the object is to provide the child with an environment such as will save him to the state and society as a useful and law-abiding citizen, and to give him the educational advantages in our various states.

This difficulty has been appreciated by the children's department at Washington and, as a consequence, a survey has been made under the direction of Miss Julia Lathrop, in charge of the department, with reference to the juvenile court acts in the various states and the manner in which it has been forced.

In the course of this survey, inquiries were addressed to nearly 2,500 courts, or agencies, to which 2,343 responded.

In the year 1918, 140,252 cases were tried in the various children's courts of the United States, and of that number 79,946, more than half, were cases of delinquency. The fact that more than one-half of these children were actually charged with the commission of crime is in itself a serious indictment against the conditions that prevail in many parts of our country. I, therefore, wish to digress for a moment and present to you the situation that in many instances confronts these children who in such appalling numbers have passed through our courts.

WHERE HOUSING IS DEPLORABLE

In nearly all of our large cities there are congested sections where housing conditions are deplorable. Often families of five, six or seven live in either one or two rooms. In many instances to meet the economic stringency of the family life, strangers are brought into these congested quarters and occupy a bed when not in use by a member of the family, thus making for lack of privacy and hence, lack of modesty. The husband is often engaged in work that requires no skill, and deadly monotonous in its character; it constitutes and is considered merely a daily grind. There is nothing uplifting or exhilarating about it, and when he returns to his squalid, ill-kept home, he brings no cheer to it, and its desolateness adds dullness to the family life.

The situation in which the mother finds herself, adds but despair to it; she is either confined to an all-day drudgery of the care of her family and household, or she is compelled by the exigencies of economic conditions surrounding the home to also become a wage earner. Often this father and mother bring to their married life but little education and no experience in the world, and the development of their married life is narrow in the extreme, and the horizon of their outlook very limited. In an environment of this kind the children must necessarily be severely handicapped. Unrestrained in their movements, with no supervision over the impulses of their infantile mind, often deprived of the neighborhood settlement house or small playground, the children have no opportunity for sane development of mind, or a proper outlet for their energy.

THE FAMILY'S LAST CONSIDERATION

Where some religious instruction is given the child, it is limited usually to but one day a week; and only in the schoolhouse is the child afforded the first consistent contact with opportunities for his or her welfare, and in these congested districts the attendance of the child is uncertain and very irregular. The child enters at a late year and leaves at the earliest opportunity, and often in the interim the child is kept home by the parents either to meet cases of illness in the family or to take care of a younger child. In fact, the welfare of the child is the last consideration in the struggle of the family for its economic existence.

There has been no purpose in presenting this background of many of our children, save to place before the public the necessity to have the juvenile court and its every agency developed to its highest efficiency.

Not only have these 79,946 delinquent cases shown evidence of actual crime on the part of the children, the remainder of the 140,000 children were either dependents, or in some way a charge to the public, and therefore a potential factor in the development of crime.

It is only in our larger cities, such as New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, and cities of more than 250,000 inhabitants, where the juvenile court functions properly. In all the states but one there is provision for separate procedure for the juvenile offender, but in many states the provisions are inadequate, and in many others, while the legislation if carried out efficiently would secure an effective juvenile court, yet the means have not been provided for an adequate system, save in the larger cities; the reason for that being that the application of the laws and the enforcement thereof are left to the various counties in the state, and the financial budget of such counties for the work is entirely inadequate.

The survey heretofore spoken of also shows that while every state but one has legislation for the juvenile delinquent, less than half, namely, 45 per cent have a separate judge or probation service connected with the juvenile court, and of this 45 per cent, less than half have paid probation officers, and the rest are entirely dependent upon volunteer service.

COURT'S PRIVILEGES MUST BE EQUITABLY DISTRIBUTED

Our full responsibility will not be met towards the children who are subject to the jurisdiction of our children's court unless provision is made so that the benefits of the juvenile court and its agencies be distributed impartially to one and all throughout every state and throughout the nation. As it is, the rural communities suffer very much because through lack of funds they are deprived of the benefits of the legislation enacted.

A further study of the survey shows that in the larger cities where we have a highly specialized juvenile court, as in Chicago, with proper facilities for examination and probation, that a much larger proportion of delinquent children are placed on probation, and a much smaller proportion sent to institutions. We further read from this report that in many of the states there are no separate correctionary institutions for the care of children, and when punishment is incarceration, the confinement is either in the ordinary jail or prison.

In one of such rural districts in one of our states, the disposition of children's cases was as follows:

65 were sent to jail;
40 placed in the chain gang;
12 sent to reformatories;
1 to an orphanage;
156 fined;
156 dismissed;
26 in which judgments were suspended, and only 51 placed on probation.

TREATMENT OF THE VARIOUS CLASSES

It is our duty to prevent such discrimination being made against some of the children of our land. The delinquent child must be treated the same as the dependent, namely, the neglected or homeless child. Legislation to

that effect has been enacted. The court has the power to grant this protection to the delinquent child, and the community must see to it that such protection is bestowed.

The highest development in the treatment of the juvenile delinquent and dependent as set forth in this survey, is found in the Judge Baker Foundation in Boston, through which all the children before the juvenile court are given a thorough physical examination, their mental condition is carefully studied, and especially qualified investigators attached to the staff of the Foundation gather the social data. All the information in a given case is then assembled and studied at a staff conference, and a diagnosis of the child's condition, and a recommendation as to the kind of treatment needed, is made by one person qualified to determine it and evaluate all the facts. Child welfare work will make its best progress and reach its highest efficiency when every state strives to attain the highly specialized development afforded by the Judge Baker Foundation. It should not depend upon the private fortune of an individual to bring about this standard, but the state should meet its responsibilities and duties towards its children and citizens.

Every dependent or delinquent child should either be under the control of a parent who shall meet his or her responsibilities and give that child a proper environment, or be under the control of some branch of the juvenile court, properly equipped to afford the child a fair chance as far as nature has endowed it to meet the problems of life. The stain that attaches to imprisonment leaves its indelible mark upon the character of the child and creates prejudice in the minds of the public; therefore, the last place in the world for the child delinquent is an institution which is of a correctionary character.

It is a question of education and discipline, a question of proper environment, and if we could establish throughout our land institutions of as high a character as that of the Baker Foundation, we would create a potential agency in the unmaking of the criminal and the prevention of making one.

THE OFFENDER BETWEEN SEVENTEEN AND TWENTY-FIVE

Let us take up the case of the youthful offender between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five. It must be apparent to many of you who have come in contact with men of these ages either in your prison investigation or psychopathic and psychiatric examination, that a great proportion of crime is committed by young men between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five. The public and the community is made aware of that fact by the news columns of the daily papers. In fact, they constitute forty to fifty per cent of the criminal offenders. In the eyes of the law under the enactment of juvenile legislation these men are considered adults. It must be apparent, also, to all of you that the determination that one boy one day less than seventeen, and another boy one day over seventeen, committing the same offense, are subject to different laws, different examination, different care and different punishment is arbitrary and unjust in the extreme. It may well be said that such arbitrary differentiation must be made at some time in fixing responsibility; but in my mind the justice and unfairness that often result from such arbitrary delimitation would be obviated if the principle that motivated the development of the juvenile court were applied to criminal offenders between these ages.

Just as we have in our juvenile courts provisions made for an investigation of the mental antecedents of an offender, we should also have provided for this young adult offender an investigation of his animation and the social conditions surrounding him; also an examination to determine his mental capacity. As a result of such examination we would often find the same environment as surround our dependent and delinquent, and by modern and scientific methods it would be found that very frequently a young man between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five has but the mentality of a boy of eight or twelve years; the only difference being that his experience in life, by reason of greater years, may have grafted upon his deficient mental makeup more fixed habits dangerous to society. If, however, the crime

does not show an abandoned heart, there is no reason why the same humane provisions should not be made for this class of offender as for the juvenile delinquent.

NOT PUNISHMENT, BUT EDUCATION AND DISCIPLINE

Again, it should become not merely a question of punishment, but education and discipline. In some of the states of our Union, and in some of our cities, this principle has been recognized, especially in the city of Boston, where a psychopathic institute is at the service not only of the boy's court or the juvenile court, but at the service of every agency in the state, in order that there may be a proper and intelligent physical and mental examination made by trained psychologists and psychiatrists. Some of the other larger cities have made similiar provisions, but in the main such legislation has not been looked on with favor in many of our states. While all the states of our Union have made provision for probation for the juvenile offender, quite a number of states have no provisions for adult probation, even for first offenders, and where such provisions have been made they are often entirely inadequate and fail to provide a proper staff of probation officers to give effect to such provisions. Just as probation is an efficient force for juvenile delinquent and dependent, so probation can be a great factor for reformation and restoration of the young adult offender, and any legislation which endeavors to curtail probation, or rather fails to extend its application, is reactionary.

There are some crimes of a character (even outside of capital offenses) for which probation could not be allowed, but in the vast number of offenses in the category of crime the first offender should receive the benefit of probation.

It might be said that most of the states have such provisions for probation, but my investigation of the subject leads me to make this statement: That with the exception of two or three states, notably that of Massachusetts and New York, the use of probation is very limited.

Very little discretion is left to the judge. The law usually provides exactly the character of the offense for which probation may be given, makes the value of the property the determining factor, and limits the application of the provision of probation to the first offender. To my mind there should be but one limitation upon the judge's discretion to grant probation, and that is not to act in any way as to endanger society. Save for certain grave offenses, if a judge after having before him reports as to the physical and mental examination of the offender, and also from the investigation of his antecedents and environment is convinced that the offender should have the opportunity to again take his place in society without suffering physical punishment, then probation should follow. I am just as firmly of the opinion that in the case of the first offender, if reports and examination satisfy the court that such person released on probation would be a danger to society, and that society would be better protected by having him removed from contact with it, then, whether he be a first offender or not, that person should be excluded from contact with the community.

THE SAVING OF THE YOUTH

Just as in the case of the juvenile offender, the thought that should actuate the public mind is the saving of this youthful criminal between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five to society. Physical restraint merely should not be for the purpose of punishment, even though physical restraint is provided for under conditions which make for the improvement of the offender. (Of that I will have something to say later on.) The confinement of prison and the possibility of being known as an ex-convict may tend forever to taint a man's career and check every impulse to seek redemption in the eyes of the world. Where there is a chance to salvage a human soul, and education and discipline without imprisonment will advance it, then the interest of society will be served better without prison confinement.

I had intended to speak somewhat at length with reference to the question of character of our prisons and prison management, because to my mind, if there must be confinement for the protection of society, the prisons

must be of such a character and the management of the offender such as to have the offender returned to society with a recognition of his responsibilities, and a determination to resume his place as a law-abiding citizen.

Any prison system which allows a man to stagnate, that limits his vision merely to the life within its walls, and does not impress him with the belief that while there he can prepare to meet the responsibilities of good citizenship, fails to accomplish the essential purpose for which the offender was imprisoned, namely, reformation.

But in the limited time I have left I can only present to you two phases of this subject.

First let me call your attention to the fact that in most of the prisons throughout our country today the labor of the prisoner is confiscated by the state. That practice has come down to us from time immemorial, and less advance has been made in this regard than in any other branch of prison management.

Restraint of one's liberty—that is, the right to come and go at will—proves, as time goes on, a severe strain upon every normal impulse within us. Let anyone in this audience be limited to his home, and that home a comfortable one surrounded by spacious grounds, and yet if his movements be confined to that area even for but a week, such restraint would prove most irksome.

THE EVIL OF THE CELL HOUSE

While there have been improvements in some of our prisons with reference to the buildings and their equipment, yet we do know that there is some form of cell house and a very limited opportunity for the release of physical energy. The education of the prisoner is a neglible factor in the routine of prison life. By employment of persons in various occupations, either within the prison wall or within certain limits outside of them, the time of the prisoner is consumed, but his entire life is one determined for him, and it is his province to obey the prescribed rules and regulations subject to the orders of those in charge of the prison. In other words, there is a complete subjection of the will of the prisoner. That is the essence of physical restraint, and that is why it proves so burdensome. The state has the undoubted right to deprive an offender of his liberty, but I am strongly of the opinion that it has no right to appropriate the right and ability of the men to labor. Of course, work must be provided, otherwise life in prison would be unbearable, and all efforts for the reformation of the prisoner unavailing. It is only in the sane occupation of his time, with due allowance made for recreation and education, that a correctional institution can restore the man better equipped to resume his responsibilities once he has regained his freedom. While the offender may reconcile himself to a restraint of his liberty and also welcome the opportuntiy to work, yet I am of the opinion that he resents the appropriation of the proceeds of his labor without a return of the equivalent of its value; a fair wage over and above the expense of his confinement to the state.

Where a prisoner's time is used in labor, which either brings a profit to the state from the articles manufactured by him or saves to the state the employment of another individual whose work the prisoner does, the prisoner should be entitled to have placed to his credit either the profit or the wage saved to the state by his labor. Against this should be charged the expense of his maintenance. Everything over and above should either be given to the family depending on him, or it should be given him upon his release from the prison, when he again assumes his place in society.

There is no more degrading influence upon the man who still has some character left than the knowledge that by his criminal act he has not only forfeited his right to freedom, but has also brought misery and a state of helplessness to those who had been dependent upon him; and there is no greater force for uplifting a criminal and making him look to the future than the knowledge that while he is paying the price of his offense against society by being deprived of his liberty, he is contributing to the welfare of his family.

DIFFICULTIES CAN BE OVERCOME

There may be difficulties in making provision for such employment of prisoners so as to return a profit, but they can be overcome easily. There is no question that, to begin with, the labor of prisoners can be employed upon articles and materials for use in public institutions. This is being done in Massachusetts, and a report of the bureau of prisons in that state shows that the sale of articles manufactured in the state prison amounted to $571,-356; sales in the women's reformatory at Schermerhorn amounted to $132,-867; at the men's reformatory at Concord, the sales amounted to $220,016, making a total of $924,239; the net profit of such sales was $218,817.31. Among some of the articles manufactured were aluminum ware, bedding, blankets, boy's clothing, men's clothing, flags, furniture, hosiery, shoes, and so forth.

In Chicago, in an institution where the average sentence of a prisoner was three months, namely, the House of Correction, to which persons convicted of misdemeanors were sent, an experiment was made by Mr. John Whitman (the present Director of Prisons in Illinois.) While he was in charge of that institution, without provision of law but with the consent of the trustees, prisoners were employed in doing work for the city. They manufactured all the street brooms and ash receptacles used by the city of Chicago in its cleaning department. They baked all the bread for all the public insitutions of Chicago, save the hospitals; they also junked all old and discarded machinery used by the city, and while I have not the detailed figures before me, such work resulted in a profit, and by arrangement of the trustees, the men having families, who worked in the prison, were given the profits

UNION LABOR WILL DO RIGHT THING

In meeting this situation we need not fear the position of union labor, because I am convinced that union labor will take an advanced position on this, as it has on all vital questions of the day. Union labor will co-operate with every other agency in having such a prison management as will not only protect society, but also make for the reformation of the prisoner and his ability to resume his place in society.

Therefore, if a man as he enters prison knows that his labor will be used for the comfort of his family while he is in prison, or that it will be turned over to him when he comes out to reinstate himself in the community, he begins with an objective which will carry him through that trying period of imprisonment and will make him look forward to the day of his release with confidence in his ability to assume responsibility, and with no resentment against society.

The other question I wish to touch upon is that of parole. When we speak of parole we have in mind also the indeterminate sentence, which in its accepted sense means that for a particular crime there is a minimum and maximum term a prisoner may be called upon to serve, the period of time depending on that agency in each state charged with the control of prisoners and granting parole.

THE RIGHT AND JUSTICE OF PAROLE

In the beginning of my talk, I spoke of the distrust and disfavor that has been engendered in the community with reference to the paroling of a criminal. To my mind it is important that this attitude should be dispelled, and that the agency that has made for part of this feeling of suspicion, namely, the press, be the medium through which the confidence of the community in the system of prison parole be firmly established. To that end the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology should bend its every energy, and by its research and investigation place before the community, through the medium of the press, the real facts on the question of parole. The principle information placed before the community today, and that mostly in the form of headlines, is that a crime has been committed, that a paroled man has committed it, and then follows either a direct or veiled

attack on the agency granting parole, and a stinging criticism on the abuse of the parole system. We must recognize there have been men who, as events showed, did not justify the confidence reposed in them to make good, and also that at times men have been paroled through improper influences. Such a situation, however, should not militate against the principle of parole, because every remedial welfare measure for the benefit of the weaker part of our community has often failed to reach its objective, not, however, because of the inherent defect in the measure, but because of the manner in which it was administered, or because of a mistaken judgment as to the beneficiary. What I am most concerned about is the hasty and ill-considered criticism made upon the general principle without the necessary reservation upholding the principle. The first requisite to overcome the prejudice against parole is to have the welfare board or agency having in charge the release of prisoners on parole made up of men and women who are familiar with the subject of criminology, who are above suspicion of being influenced by either political or personal consideration, and who can be held directly responsible for their acts. If the public knows that such a board is acting, then all question of favoritism or incompetency will be dispelled. The next step is to acquaint the public with the workings of the parole system. Statistics should be gathered, which show not merely the number of crimes but the character of crimes committed; for often there are certain periods of unrest and certain general conditions which result in trivial criminal acts and these outbreaks are but temporary and sporadic. The public should not only be made familiar with the failures of parole, but with its successes.

LACK OF SUPERVISION IS PREVAILING

Just as in probation, the great difficulty with the proper working of parole is the failure in most of the states to provide for sufficient officers to supervise and care for the paroled man, and to encourage his contact with society. But the great factor that the community must consider is the effect parole has upon the convicted man who is serving his sentence in prison. It is conceded that no system of prison management is progressive unless there is an objective towards which the prisoner is constantly working. While in places of confinement he may show advancement, such as from a cell house to a cottage prison, and from an enclosure to comparative freedom, restricted only by the limits of prison territory and extending even to work in places entirely apart from prison surveillance, the real goal that is ever before the prisoner is his ultimate release. If that can be hastened by proper observance of prison regulations, by understanding service in the various branches of work assigned to him, by earnest application to educational advantages offered, all of which is a preparation for the resumption of the responsibilities of good citzenship; if the reward for this effort within the prison will secure for him the earlier opportunity to demonstrate his right to meet the responsibilities of good citizenship out of prison, such objective will prove the great urge in his prison life.

The consciousness on the part of a convicted man that he has been released on parole before the expiration of the maximum sentence is a tremendous factor in his reformation and in the rebuilding of his character.

A PROTECTION TO THE PUBLIC

Paroles, like probation, can in my opinion be far more effective instrumentalities in the protection of society against crime than hard, drastic punishment.

Lack of sympathy in the public mind with probation and parole is due first, to the lack of information that the public has of their effectiveness even while operating under adverse conditions, and second, to the lack of funds to properly equip and maintain an efficient and capable probation and parole system.

If the information could be brought home to the community it would be found that the sum of the experience of the states and courts in which the probation and parole system had been given its longest and most thorough

trial is that it is an essential part of the judicial and correctional system of the state. One of the difficulties has been that where the probation service has been established there has been such an overloading of its officers so as to not only threaten, but actually to impair, the quality of its work.

In New York, where the number of paid officers was 197, the number of persons in their care at one time in the year 1918 was 14,552; an average of 73 charges for each officer. In Massachusetts, with 154 officers and the number of cases at one time 14,990, the average per year was almost 100. The figures are at hand in these two states because they have a state probation commission. The report of the probation officer for Cook county indicates a like situation, but even these figures do not indicate the load carried by a single officer because the figures given are the average. Sometimes during the period of a year an officer has nearly 300 persons in his charge. His service must not only be one of restraint to a probationer, but also one of helpfulness and therefore such overloading results in a lack of that thorough attention which is the most obvious requisite in accomplishing the purpose of probation. It is remarkable, in my opinion, that any results have been obtained from the probation service, handicapped as it has been by lack of funds, no matter where it has been placed in operation. That even partial success has been attained is a strong tribute to the essential goodness in human nature, which can be appealed to and can become the real formative factor in the dependable restoration of an offender to society.

THE NEED FOR SUFFICIENT, COMPETENT PAROLE OFFICERS

What I have said here in reference to probation applies with equal force to the question of parole, save that there is a still greater necessity for securing an adequate and competent staff of parole officers, because the man once in prison, even though he has earned an early release because of advancement made by him in prison, starts out with the great handicap of having been in prison, a handicap in his loss of confidence in himself and a still greater handicap because of the prevailing lack of confidence in him by the average individual in the community.

Any danger threatening the physical and moral welfare of our people strikes at the very source of our strength and at the very heart of the nation. Their physical and moral strength must be protected at any cost, so that if ever the principles of our government which guarantee the liberty and freedom of our people are threatened, the people themsleves—in their own strength of character and saneness of mind—will overcome the danger through their devotion, loyalty, and patriotism to the institutions of our land.

Therefore, if we bring home to the public through the medium of the press (the greatest agency for progress that this country has,) the problems underlying the criminal conditions of the present day, effecting the bone and sinew of our government—namely, the welfare of its citizens, their young sons and daughters—the people will realize the wisdom of dealing with the juvenile offender and the young adult offender, not only as a wrong-doer, but as one in special need of care and protection. As a consequence the people will not only grant, but demand the expenditure of sufficient moneys—first, to maintain a juvenile court with its every agency fully developed, not only in one state or part of a state, but for the benefit of the people in every state and every part of each state; second, to obtain the full benefit of a properly maintained and equipped parole and probation system; to the end that there may be conserved for the continued welfare of our people their virility, energy, and morality.

METHODS AND RESULTS OF ADMINISTRATION

[By John L. Whitman, Superintendent of Prisons.]

Note: This paper was presented by the Superintendent of Prisons of the Division of Prisons of the Department of Public Welfare at the twelfth annual meeting of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology held at Indianapolis, September 17, 1920. It has to deal with the methods and results of the administration of the Illinois parole law under the Division of Pardons and Paroles. Mr. Whitman, as Superintendent of the Division of Prisons, was assigned by the Director of the Department of Public Welfare as an associate of the Superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles under the co-operative plan adopted by the Department of Public Welfare.

In Illinois, the Civil Administrative Code, which brought into being the Department of Public Welfare July 1, 1917, makes possible, for the first time in the history of that state, a real and effective co-operation between the prison management and the administration of the parole law, without which co-operation, the best results could not obtain.

The Division of Prisons, and the Division of Pardons and Paroles, each a part of the Department of Public Welfare, I am pleased to be able to say, work in hearty accord, and to the same end, as evidence of which, better results in the administration of the parole law are obtained each year; and the policies of the Division of Prisons in dealing with prisoners are being recognized by the Division of Pardons and Paroles in the following procedure, as a necessary course for the preparation for parole:

1. Study of mental, physical, and social characteristics of prisoners.
2. Classification, according to needs and abilities of individual prisoners.
3. Operation of a Progressive Merit System working toward freedom.

This Progressive Merit System, being a thing that is entirely visible to the prisoners, serves to maintain discipline and promote industry, as well as to fit the prisoners for successful careers in after life; and provides that they pass through the following stages while in preparation for freedom:

a.—Confinement within the prison, and subjection to all the prison rules, with very little if any personal responsibility.
b.—Increasing opportunity to merit more confidence on the part of prison authorities, by strict application to industry and adherence to prison regulations.
c.—Positions of trust within the prison walls.
d.—Life in cottages outside the prison walls; under supervision of the prison officials.
e.—Work on the prison farm, without guards.
f.—Parole.
g.—Freedom.

Under this plan more importance is attached to character building than to the mere serving of time—or in other words—the plan is, when carried out, in reality a course of preparation for parole and ultimate freedom, which can reasonably be expected to develop the qualifications necessary to good citizenship.

The Division of Pardons and Paroles is guided by the progress made under the merit system in fixing the date when the case of a prisoner will be considered. Then the nature of the charge, the previous history, and the prisoner's mental attitude, as well as the progress made under the merit system, are an aid to the Division of Pardons and Paroles in concluding upon the length of time it will take to complete the course of preparation and at the same time be a punishment, by way of confinement in prison, that will be commensurate with the crime committed.

WORK OF PRISON STAFF

The principles and provisions of the Progressive Merit System are, in each of the penal institutions of the state, carried out by a staff (which is composed of the warden, his assistant, the physician, psychiatrist, psychol-

ogist, and at least two of the subordinate prison officials who are in personal contact with the prisoners constantly, and have intimate knowledge of their natural inclinations and habits.

This staff meets daily, and their deliberations and conclusions are minutely recorded by a secretary. It considers cases and interviews prisoners at regular intervals, as progress or lack of progress is shown, as well as new cases.

Thus, there are (or should be) no misunderstandings between the prisoners and the staff. Each prisoner is told just what he may or may not do; what is expected of him; and what he must learn before freedom is given him through the operation, in his case, of the parole law.

While the law does not permit of a parole in any case until the minimum sentence of at least one year shall have been served; yet during all that year the staff is studying the individual—really gathering and recording valuable information which, upon being furnished to the Division of Pardons and Paroles, enables it to pass intelligently upon the case and determine, with a reasonable amount of assurance, whether or not the prisoner is apt to become a fit subject for parole, and if so, how long a course of training should be given him.

Immediately upon commitment of a convicted person he or she is thoroughly examined by the physician, psychiatrist, and the psychologist, each of whom prepares a report of his findings, which they submit for the consideration of the staff—of which they are a part. With this information before it, the staff, without delay, calls the prisoner into conference, at which time the Progressive Merit System is fully explained, and the prisoner's ability along industrial lines is considered. His mental and physical qualifications are taken into consideration, and a work-program is decided upon which, in the judgment of the staff, will help him to assume a better mental attitude (if that is needed); and then, possibly, the individual attention the staff will give him later on, will result in or be the means of giving to the prisoner a more correct viewpoint of life than he had entertained before. The Progressive Merit System also provides that progress, or lack of progress along these lines shall be recorded for the benefit of the Division of Pardons and Paroles.

CLASSIFICATION OF PRISONERS

Prisoners are divided into five grades: A, B, C, D, and E. Upon commitment, each prisoner is assigned to Grade C, and is eligible for promotion into Grade B after a period of three months. Each prisoner must show steady progress in Grade B for three months before advancement into Grade A, then progress must continue for three months before they become eligible for a hearing before the Division of Pardons and Paroles.

The basis of markings in workmanship includes: sincerity of effort to produce results, as well as the amount and character of work produced.

The basis of markings in behavior includes, not only the gradings of the keeper, but staff judgment—after considering the mental and physical capabilities of the prisoner, together with the general attitude and honesty of purpose displayed.

Failure on the part of the prisoner, which is shown by percentage markings, causes promotion to be withheld, or demotion into a lower grade, in accordance with rules formulated to govern the activities of the staff.

Advantages or penalties, by way of gain or loss of time to be served, are attached to each grade, except that while in Grade C the prisoner must serve "flat time".

If the prisoner has not advanced through Grade C, B, and A in accordance with the rules of the staff, he is not eligible for a hearing before the Division of Pardons and Paroles, even though he may have served the minimum sentence provided for his crime.

It is possible, however, for the prisoner to gain promotion and maintain such a grade under the Progressive Merit System, as to entitle him to a hearing before the Division of Pardons and Paroles in eleven months, which is the statutory minimum in most of the cases.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

But whether he comes before the division in eleven months, or at a later time, the division has before it the record of the prisoner, which is the result of a comprehensive study pursued for at least a year, from different angles, by the psychiatrist, psychologist and other prison officials. Finally, their opinions are combined into a judgment, which is verified by the records of the staff operating the Progressive Merit System.

CO-OPERATION UNDER THE SYSTEM

The staff does not consider the penalty to be fixed or the crime committed. It has simply studied the individual, and endeavored to conclude from that study what might be reasonably expected, so far as his future conduct is concerned.

The Division of Pardons and Paroles does consider the crime and the previous criminal history or record of the prisoner, as well as the staff findings, which may indicate that the prisoner should undergo treatment that may take several years to administer. So a time (within the maximum) is fixed by the Division of Pardons and Paroles for the prisoner to serve, which will be reduced—or lengthened—depending upon the effort or lack of effort on the part of the prisoner to properly prepare himself for good citizenship.

When the time for release, as fixed by the Division of Pardons and Paroles (less whatever time may have been earned through the operation of the Progressive Merit System) approaches, preparations are made for the prisoner to go out upon parole—properly sponsored, and with a job to go to.

The state of Illinois provides for an organization to assist the Superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles in making these preparations, and in exercising supervision over paroled prisoners, which organization is composed of two assistant superintendents, a chief parole agent, an assistant chief parole agent, one supervisor of paroles at each of the penal institutions, and twenty parole agents, located in different parts of the state.

In order to facilitate the work of supervision the state is divided into ten districts, with a headquarters, and at least one parole agent in each district.

The chief parole agent works out of the main office of the Division of Pardons and Paroles, at Springfield, which is, incidentally, the headquarters for the district in which Springfield is located. The assistant chief parole agent is in charge of the Chicago office, which is the headquarters for the district comprising the twelve northern counties of the state, including Chicago and Cook county. At least six parole agents are assigned to work out of this office, in addition to the one in charge.

WORK OF PAROLE AGENTS

The work of these parole agents in Chicago is supplemented by the assistance of six detective-sergeants assigned to work out of the parole office by the chief of police of the city of Chicago, under an arrangement made between the Division of Pardons and Paroles and the chief of police, for the dual purpose of having ample supervision over the paroled prisoners, and to detect them quickly if they are inclined to commit crime, or in any way violate their paroles; and as means of giving the police department information which would obviate the necessity of mentioning "paroled prisoners" in "drag-net" orders sent out by the police department, and other discriminations, which, in the past, have worked hardships upon parolees endeavoring to live up to their parole agreements; and which has oft-times been the cause of ultimate violations. Under this plan, the co-operation with the police department of the city of Chicago has worked out fairly well and in some respects exceedingly well.

WORK WITH COMMITTING AUTHORITIES

In other large cities of the state, such as East St. Louis, Springfield, Rock Island, Peoria, Moline, and Streator, this sort of co-operation has led to the chiefs of police, state's attorneys, and other public officials taking an

interest in the administration of the parole law. In some of the cities mentioned, the chiefs of police act as sponsors for paroled prisoners. while in other localities the state's attorneys act in a similar capacity.

State's Attorney Andrews of Coles county, has, at various times, expressed considerable pride in the fact that there has never been a violation of parole in cases in which he has acted as sponsor.

This co-operation of public officials does not mean that there is a "police supervision" exercised over parolees; but rather a "friendly", "big-brotherly" supervision, which proves to be of the greatest benefit to parolees who honestly desire to live up to their parole agreements.

In spite of the newspaper comments to the contrary, even in Chicago, the co-operation given by the police departments is fast becoming more of a "friendly" supervision—getting away from the old-time idea, which meant the arrest of parolees whenever and wherever they were seen.

Some prisoners are fortunate, in that they have homes to go to, and relatives or responsible friends, who are willing to render assistance by seeking employment and securing a sponsor for them when the time comes for them to be paroled. When this is done, and investigation by a parole agent discloses it to be satisfactory in every way, it is approved by the supervisor of paroles of the particular institution in which the prisoner is confined, and a parole agreement is entered into between the Division of Pardons and Paroles and the prisoner about to be released. It remains then, with the parole agents to see that it is carried out.

But in order that proper sponsors and jobs may be secured for those who have no means of getting help along that line, the parole agents in the several districts are required to keep in touch with conditions in their respective districts—the demand for work of all kinds, as well as the possibility of finding suitable homes for parolees.

SUPERVISION OF PAROLEES

The parole supervisors notify or instruct the parole agents in one or more districts (when it is thought advisable) that certain prisoners have been ordered paroled, and that sponsors and jobs are sought for them. A rather minute discription of the prisoners are given, their condition of health is noted, and their ability to do certain kinds of work is emphasized. The parole agents experience but little difficulty in finding proper sponsors, the right kind of jobs, and suitable homes.

By holding the parole agents responsible for what they do in matters of this kind, the trouble and difficulties formerly had because of irresponsible sponsors and employes, is not experienced now. However, parole agents frequently find it advisable to transfer a parolee from one sponsor to another, or from one job to another; but in most of the cases, when a transfer is made, it is because the parolee has shown the ability to hold a better position, or to assume greater responsibility—and not because the sponsor or employer have become dissatisfied.

The parole agents in a district supervises parolees from all the penal institutions in the state, who are located in his particular district.

When a parolee is released, he reports to the sponsor and the employer previously arranged for by the parole agent, after which an arrival report is mailed back to the institution supervisor of paroles, endorsed by both the sponsor and the employer. Thereafter, a report is sent to the supervisor of paroles on the first day of each month, which report contains a detailed account of earnings and expenditures; and this report must be endorsed by the sponsor and the employer, as to its correctness. In the meantime, the parole agent either visits the parolee, or investigates the progress he is making at least once every month—or oftener—if circumstances justify or require it.

The parole agents make daily reports, in duplicate, upon all parolees visited or investigated by them during the day, a copy of which is sent to the supervisor of paroles of the institution from which the parolee was released, and the other to the chief parole agent at the main office at Springfield.

If a parolee has defaulted, or is missing, the sponsor or the employer notifies the parole agent in the district, the chief parole agent, or the supervisor of paroles at the institution. In either case, notice is subsequently sent out to all parole agents, advising that a certain parolee has violated. This notice is accompanied by a photograph and description of the defaulter —and the parole agent, incidental to his other work, searches for the defaulter.

At the end of each month, the parole agents make a monthly report showing the number of parolees in their district from all the institutions; how many times they have visited or investigated parolees; what transfers have been made, the number and character of violations, as well as any suggestions or recommendations they may deem advisable or necessary. These reports must check and coincide with monthly reports of the parole supervisors of the different institutions, and are considered by the Division of Pardons and Paroles at the regular monthly sessions at the institutions.

With this data before it, the Division of Pardons and Paroles is enabled to give specific directions to the parole supervisors, which, in turn, is transmitted to the parole agents concerned.

CONSIDERED BEST METHOD

While the organization I have thus briefly outlined is somewhat new, it has been in operation sufficiently long to give evidence of improvement over previous methods and results. It had its basis in the enactment of the Civil Administrative Code, which became effective July 1, 1917. During the two years following this date, while the organization was being perfected in some respects, there had been very inadequate provisions made by the legislature by way of a sufficient amount of help necessary to produce the best results. However, we were enabled to make such demonstrations as justified the last legislature in appropriating funds requisite to obtain the desired help; so it has only been since July, 1919, that the organization has had the opportunity to demonstrate its full worth.

In the meantime, it has been necessary to overcome, in some localities, and especially in Chicago, a very strong prejudice against the parole law, which prejudice was created, not so much because of the manner in which it was previously administered (as it is claimed) but because of the fact that heretofore there was not the close and consistent supervision which is now exercised and consequently, it could not be proven that the statements made by those who, for reasons not understood, were opposed to the parole law were false.

In times past, it has been sensationally heralded throughout the state (if not the country) that the Illinois parole law or its administration was responsible for the crime waves in Chicago. It was only after adequate supervision could be given, and actual facts ascertained, that statements of that kind could be disproved and parolees who were deserving protected against unjust attacks.

I have reasons to believe that now it is being learned by many that the public sentiment aroused against the parole law of Illinois was due to misstatements made publicly, which were engendered by a lack of reliable information—to say the least.

During the winter and spring of this year much was said publicly in Chicago about the bad effect of the parole law; and the public was led to believe that the crime wave then prevalent in Chicago was due largely to the presence of paroled prisoners in the city—and the inference, at least, was that they came from Joliet.

THE REAL FACTS

Here are the facts, which I quote from the semi-annual report of the supervisor of paroles of the Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet, dated June 30, 1920:

"Fifty-eight prisoners released on parole into the first district (including the city of Chicago) since January 1, 1920.

"One charged with the commission of a crime, awaiting trial in the Cook county jail.

"One suspected of having committed a crime—at large.
"Three were returned to the prison—conduct unsatisfactory—technical violators.
"The remaining fifty-three are serving their paroles, and are in good standing."

In addition to this, there were 141 prisoners on parole from Joliet in the first district on January 1, 1920. Of this number, 12.06 percent violated their paroles in one way or another, most of them technical violators. None were charged with the commission of serious crimes.

This would make only 199 prisoners in the first district from Joliet, and to put the worst construction possible upon the conduct of the small percentage whose conduct was unsatisfactory would not justify such criticisms of the parole law as were made publicly.

There was, at the same time, a smaller number of paroled boys from the Illinois State Reformatory at Pontiac in the first district, with about the same percentage of violations. Inasmuch as Joliet and Pontiac are the only institutions which send paroled prisoners into the first district, the sum total of parolees in that district was less than 400; with not more than 40 violations of paroles. They assuredly were not (and our records give positive proof that they were not) to any noticeable extent, responsible for the so-called "crime-wave" in Chicago during the winter and spring.

Of the total 643 prisoners released upon parole from Joliet and Pontiac, during the year ending August 31, 1920:

37 or 5.75 percent were returned to the institutions from which they were released, for technical violations.
54 or 8.40 percent defaulted, and are at large.
10 or 1.55 percent were committed to other institutions including jails.
5 or .78 percent were returned to institutions from which they were released, on new sentences.
537 or 83.52 percent gave entire satisfaction.

It was claimed recently that during the last five years more prisoners were paroled into Cook county, Chicago, than were committed to the prisons from that county. The records of the institutions have been checked thoroughly, and this has been found untrue.

The records will show that during the five years, 1,539 persons were received from Cook county at the Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet; and that during that same period, 1,218 were paroled to Cook county.

In the same period, 1,404 persons were received in the Illinois State Reformatory at Pontiac from Cook county; and 895 were paroled to Cook county in the same length of time.

It is quite often the case that those committed from Chicago have no real home there, and the Division of Pardons and Paroles finds that it would be to the best interest of the prisoner to serve his parole elsewhere. Consequently that is done, which accounts for the comparatively small number of prisoners paroled to Cook county.

Occasionally those committed from Cook county have such a history or record there as plainly indicates that they would have difficulty if returned there to serve a parole. In such cases, the Division of Pardons and Paroles orders that they must serve their paroles "outside of Cook county" (Chicago). The policy of paroling prisoners to localities where, it is believed, they will be better able to rehabilitate themselves, is consistently carried out.

DEFINITE SENTENCE PAROLE

An amendment to the parole law was enacted, and became effective in 1915, making it possible for those serving definite sentences to be paroled under certain conditions.

The first of the conditions is that the prisoner must serve at least the minimum of the sentence provided by law for the crime committed.

Second, that the prisoner be required to serve at least one-third of the sentence imposed by the court.

For instance: A prisoner may have been sentenced for the crime of murder, to a term of thirty years. The minimum for murder under the Illinois statutes is fourteen years, which, reduced by the "good-time" law,

(provided it is earned) makes eight years and three months. So the prisoner would not be eligible to make application for a definite sentence parole until after he had served one-third of his sentence, which, in the case outlined, would be ten years. If a parole was granted, the prisoner would be required to serve the maximum of his sentence on parole—the maximum sentence of thirty years is sixteen years, three months, allowing the good time; so in this case if the prisoner was released at the expiration of ten years, he would be required to serve six years and three months upon parole.

A prisoner serving a life sentence is, under the provisions of this amendment, eligible for a definite sentence parole after he has served fully twenty years (without allowance for "good-time"). Then, if paroled, he may be required to serve the remainder of his life on parole—if conditions and circumstances justify.

In long term paroles, such as outlined above, the rules of the Division of Pardons and Paroles require that the parolee report to the parole supervisor at the institution from which he was paroled, for the first two years, monthly; for the following two years, quarterly; for the fifth year, semi-annually, and thereafter, annually, until such time as he shall in the discretion of the Division of Pardons and Paroles, be granted his final discharge.

OUTSIDE OF STATE PAROLE

Under the 1919 amendment to the parole law, prisoners may be released on parole to their homes, outside the state of Illinois, under rules and regulations as follows: First, the sponsor must be a public official, such as the mayor or chief of police of a city, or the state's attorney or sheriff of a county.

Great care is exercised in securing employment for these prisoners paroled outside the state, which is done through correspondence, by the supervisor of paroles. The choice is subject to the approval of the sponsor, who agrees to keep the parolee under his personal supervision, and to see that he remains steadily employed at some legitimate business, during the length of the parole period. This is necessary because of the fact that there are no parole agents to supervise these outside the state parolees. It is the policy of the Division of Pardons and Paroles to release only those outside the state, whose actual residence is established in the state to which they are paroled.

Illinois was one of the first, if not the first state, to enact a parole law. That was about twenty-five years ago; and the official records showing the results of its operation since that time, are conclusive evidence of its efficacy and consequent advantages to the state over the definite sentence law. I might produce a volume of figures to prove this, but I doubt the necessity of that before this audience. Suffice it to say, that the percentage of recidivism has been materially reduced, and that prisoners are now being released from prison under such supervision as makes it possible and probable that they can and will profit by the training they received in prison, and develop into better citizens.

All the various features of the Illinois parole law as it now stands, are being administered with great care, and good results. The law is being administered by men who give all their time and attention to some particular phase of the work.

The Superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles has, as associates who sit with him as a pardon or parole board, the Assistant Director of the Department of Public Welfare, the Superintendent of Prisons, and the Criminologist, all of whom are on the staff of The Department of Public Welfare.

We believe that the essential things to be considered in perfecting the best possible plan to produce desired results from the operation of the parole law, is, first, the mental health problem presented by a certain percent of mental defectives to be found in any prison population; then the preparation of prisoners for parole while they are in prison, as outlined in this paper; and, finally wise and consistent supervision that will give the

finishing touches to the work of returning convicted persons to society, as citizens who will at least, not be a menace.

It should be kept in mind that a very large percentage of those who are sent to prisons must, in the course of a few years, be released, in accordance with the statutes, and consequently, much thought, attention and effort should be given to the possibility of returning them to society as good citizens.

This is what we are doing in Illinois.

HAMILTON CLUB ADDRESSES

PRISON ADMINISTRATION AND PAROLE

[By John L. Whitman, Superintendent of Prisons.]

Note: The following is an address delivered by the Superintendent of Prisons before the Hamilton Club of Chicago on December 19, 1919. This meeting was the result of a meeting held two weeks previously at which Mr. Thomas Mott Osborne was the chief speaker. In the course of Mr. Osborne's address he made some very severe criticisms of the administration of certain penal and reformatory institutions of the state of Illinois. The club thought it only proper and right that those responsible for the conduct of the Illinois institutions should be given an opportunity to answer these charges. In response to the invitation of the club, Mr. Whitman and Judge J. E. McClure, Assistant Director of the Department of Public Welfare, responded. The first of these is the address by Mr. Whitman.

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Hamilton Club, and Friends: From the number seated around this table and mentioned upon your program, we do not wish to leave the impression upon you that we have any desire to throttle your constructive criticism of what is being done in the state institutions or in the administration of the laws of the state; we welcome it. We come here because we feel that there is more or less confusion in the minds of the people, especially here in Chicago, due largely to conditions which apparently have aroused an adverse public sentiment against the administration of the laws, I say there seems to be a confusion of thought, so it is our purpose to simply give you facts and I will not attempt to occupy more time than is necessary to give you some salient facts that will tend toward clearing up the confusion in your minds. We believe that this is important, that every citizen should give serious thought to matters that pertain to the public welfare, and not be blinded or confused by statements given out from an irresponsible source, or by information that eminates from a selfish or personal motive. I would like to call your attention to the sort of publicity that confuses the public mind on matters that are of vital interest to the people, who should be given facts where publicity is resorted to.

CITES ONE INSTANCE

Less than thirty days ago, the friends or family of a man, an inmate of the Joliet penitentiary caused to be inserted in one of the Chicago newspapers an advertisement stating that there would be a petition for commutation filed with the Division of Pardons and Paroles, to be considered at its January, 1920, meeting. Some enterprising newspaper man, after reading the advertisement, apparently came to the conclusion at once that this individual was to be paroled, and proceeded to write an article about the inadvisability of paroling men, in spite of the fact that relief was being petitioned for under the pardon or commutation act, attacking even the parole law. He also thought it wise to interview certain public officials here in Chicago, who had previously expressed themselves in opposition to the parole law, and on this occasion were quoted as saying that the paroling of such men might well be expected when it was taken into consideration that there were soft-hearted wardens in charge of our penal institutions and the Division of Pardons and Paroles was made up of sentimental men. About the same time, if not the same day, an article appeared in another daily newspaper, charging these same men with practicing cruelties in the administration of the law; and about the same time a man from another state, who was not in possession of facts, was making the same charge in a public address before you men of the Hamilton Club. It is not my purpose to comment upon these divergent criticisms, more than to suggest that in view of conditions here in Chicago, it is about time for you to make an attempt to get actual facts, so that your opinions will be based upon reliable information.

OPPORTUNITY FOR GETTING THE FACTS

Unfortunately comparatively few people have the opportunity to get first handed information in regard to these matters so it is but natural that conclusions are reached and opinions are sometimes based upon that sort of information. I am going to ask you gentlemen not to come to such hasty conclusions, for there are ways of getting at actual facts and we ask you to take the pains to get them. I want to assure you that when you do, you will come to the conclusion that the men charged with the great responsibility of the administration of the law are not unduly sentimental or soft-hearted, nor are they unduly cruel, but are really conscientious. Speaking for myself, I shall resist with all the power within me, to prevent the charge being proven, that I am devoid of sentiment; but so far as the exercise of sentiment is concerned in the work I am doing, it is with such sentiment as has been inspired, as your chairman said, from thirty years' actual experience in dealing with the problems we are discussing today. We ask that facts be considered, and that an effort be made to get at the facts.

Criticism based, to some extent at least, upon mis-statements of facts, or because of selfish motives, caused the Chicago Association of Commerce some time ago to conceive the plan of organizing a crime commission, for the purpose of studying conditions responsible for crime, as well as making observations of the administration of the laws and the conduct of prisons, in order to determine what the actual facts are. The commission is going about getting facts and gathering information in a business-like way. A committee of that organization has spent considerable time investigating the manner in which the parole law is administered and the prisons conducted in this state; and judging from reports made to the organization, which have been published, and from correspondence with individuals connected with it, the organization no longer justifies adverse criticism of either the law or its administration, which is evidence of that value of getting at actual facts and making use of them in a sensible way in order to form an opinion or come to a conclusion.

THE CONDITIONS UNDER THE PAROLE LAW

I would like to remind you of a few facts here today that are worthy of consideration. You have heard criticism of the parole law to the effect that prisoners are not confined in prison long enough before being released on parole. It is of interest to you to know that men committed under the parole law of this state are required, under the administration of it, to serve at least double the time that was served under the old definite sentence law, and in addition to that are required to serve a year on parole. I am not offering this information as an argument in favor of or against the parole law. I don't know as it is an argument in favor of the parole law, but perhaps it is something you don't know. As we think of that fact, we are also mindful of an impression that men are being arrested more frequently now for crimes of violence—such as robbery with a gun—than in the past. The term, under the parole law, of imprisonment for crimes of this kind has been increased three, four, or five times what it was under the definite sentence law. Can it be because of the longer term given, that there is a greater prevalence of these crimes or is it due to something else? We must keep in mind the fact that during the last four or five years there have been influences at work, such as have never been known in the world before. There has been propaganda spread which brought about conditions that were never before experienced. Is it just or right to conclude, without due thought being given, to all contributory causes, that because there is a prevalence of a certain kind of crime just now in this city, that our parole law is wrong?

ILLINOIS HAS BEST PAROLE LAW IN UNITED STATES

We, in Illinois, believe that we have the best parole law in the United States—and when we say that we do not say it without having first made a study of other laws in other states. At any rate, the after-care that is being

given to paroled men in the state of Illinois aroused the interest and hearty commendation of delegates from other states at a meeting of the American Prison Congress held recently in New York. It was practically acknowledged to be the best system in use in the country.

Another thing I would like to call your attention to because of statements made to the effect that the great majority of crime committed in Chicago is by paroled men. At present, more than eighty-eight per cent of the persons committed to Joliet—I refer to Joliet because those convicted in Chicago are sent there—I say, eighty-eight per cent of the persons committed to Joliet are first offenders. Isn't that a surprise to you? By first offenders, I mean they go there to serve their first term, not only in Joliet, but anywhere in the country.

During the last year of the operation of the definite sentence law, twenty-five years ago—I do not mention this as a matter of criticism of anyone, and don't attempt to give a reason or explanation of the fact—but in 1894, twenty-five years ago, the number of persons committed to Joliet prison was more than double what it was last year. The per cent of first-offenders was then about eighty-two per cent. I speak of this as an evidence of the decrease in the number of second-offenders under the operation of the parole law.

FEW PAROLED MEN ARE INDICTED

Some two years ago, a self-constituted committee made up of public-spirited citizens, lawyers, judges, and police officers, including the then chief of police of Chicago, went to Springfield from Chicago to complain to the governor about the operation of the parole law. The statement was made at that time by members of the committee that ninety per cent of the crime in Chicago was committed by paroled men, and in verification, it was stated that ninety per cent of the cases presented to the two previous grand juries were against paroled men. Later, we checked up those cases, and found only nine indictments out of over a thousand cases, had been found against paroled men. Three of these cases were later convicted. However, members of succeeding grand juries are still persisting in making the same statement, and it probably is a fact that the impression prevails among grand jurors that it is a fact. But it is an erroneous statement, and cannot be borne out by facts.

Let me remind you that during the last year, only four hundred and sixty-one (461) persons were committed to Joliet from all of the counties that commit to that institution. About two-thirds of that number, or three hundred came from Chicago. Not more than that number would be paroled back to Chicago. Our last report shows that at this time there are just two hundred and three (203) persons on parole in the Chicago district, which includes several counties besides Cook county.

PAROLED MEN ARE WELL SUPERVISED

We want to impress upon you the fact that probably has not been called to your attention—that these men on parole are being well supervised. The last legislature provided a sufficient force to give good supervision, and in addition to the state parole agents—as a result of arrangements made a year ago with the chief of police—we are in the heartiest co-operation with the police department of Chicago. Six officers of the police department, selected by the chief of police are working out of our office. Not that we need their help so much—but co-operation with them furnishes a means of giving information to properly authorized members of the police department in regard to paroled men that will be evidence of their effort to live up to their parole agreement. As a result of that co-operation, good results are obtained. I have here reports—I wish I had time to read them—showing how individual paroled men are succeeding in their endeavors to re-establish themselves and become good citizens. Some of them have bank accounts. The police department know this as well as we do, for they are working out of our office. They also know all about those who are not doing so well and need close supervision.

REPEATERS BEFORE AND AFTER PAROLE LAW

I want to call your attention again to the fact that when the parole law went into effect, seventeen and one-half (17½) per cent of those committed to Joliet were repeaters. Now, after a number of years' of operation of the parole law, the per cent of repeaters is down to eleven per cent. Food for thought.

I have told you that about three hundred persons are paroled into Cook county out of Joliet, during a year. From Joliet and all other institutions of the state there could not be more than five hundred a year. Have you any idea of the number of cases presented to grand juries during the course of a year? There are from three to five hundred cases submitted to each grand jury—and twelve grand juries in a year—five thousand cases in a year, at least! Can it be possible that ninety per cent of these cases be against paroled men, when there are less than five hundred men paroled to Chicago from all the institutions of the state? And they are supervised, as I have told you, not only by the state parole agents, but by the police department as well.

However, I am taking up too much time; but I hope you will bear with me because the subject is so important. I also want to speak to you briefly about the Illinois idea of prison management.

MEN SHOULD BE PREPARED WITHIN THE PRISON

Essential as it is to provide proper supervision for paroled men outside the prison, it is just as important that they be prepared while in prison, so that they will become fit subjects to safeguard the opportunities they have while on parole to become good citizens, and no longer be a menace to society. You will agree with me that preparation and supervision are the important things. Illinois has a plan already in operation looking toward this end. First, I would like to give to you this thought: We are mindful of all the various classes that go to make up a prison population. We try not to give our thought and attention only to one class and forget about the other classes. When we consider them all and recognize their disposition and tendencies, we come to the conclusion that not more than fifteen per cent are of the vicious type that will make much trouble. Warden Murphy is willing to concede there is not over ten per cent; but whatever it is, I insist that not more than fifteen per cent are of that type that will, or do make trouble in the prison and have a dominating influence over the other prisoners. It is of the greatest importance that they be controlled. There is at least twenty-five per cent of the prisoners, who, if left alone to follow their natural inclinations, will do well. They have violated the law, but want to rehabilitate themselves and get back into good citizenship and do well. If their influence in the prison is allowed to be felt, it would be for good. They would co-operate with the discipline enforced, and assist in maintaining it. But unless the fifteen per cent are controlled by the authorities, the twenty-five per cent are in constant fear of them, and are consequently dominated by their influence. The balance, or sixty per cent are the ones who are easily influenced one way or the other.

MUST HAVE CONTROL OVER PRISONERS

It is essential to the best interest of all concerned that the authorities have absolute control over a prison population. If they do not, the fifteen per cent, many of whom are natural leaders, will exert such a vicious influence over the others as to neutralize the efforts of the authorities to carry out the intention of the law and prepare prisoners for ultimate good citizenship.

If there are forms of punishment resorted to, it is as a last resort on the part of the authorities to neutralize the influence of some of the fifteen per cent, and with the aid of the twenty-five per cent, maintain a leadership over the whole number, and especially the sixty per cent, so that a good, instead of a vicious influence will predominate. If this is done, many of the fifteen per cent will finally be benefited, to the extent that they see the wisdom of so conducting themselves as to be looked upon as of the larger groups

most of whom are preparing themselves for future useful careers. I do not hesitate to say that the solitary cells at Joliet are used as a means of dealing with some of the fifteen per cent; but as I say, only as a last resort; and as we consider the best interest of the whole population, we feel justified in doing so. In spite of what has been said to the contrary, we have nothing to hide at Joliet. Everything that is done by way of punishment is recorded; as the law directs, and reasons given therefor.

You doubtless know that something over two years ago, when Mr. Murphy returned to the prison as warden, he found three companies of militia there, trying to regulate the prisoners, who had, a short time before, been a riotous mob. They had burned; they had assaulted; and had defied all authority. The three companies of militia were there, assisting in an effort to restore order out of chaos. All control had previously been lost. We are trying to regain it. It has been a slow process, but we are making no excuses. We are getting control and doing away with harsh punishment.

THE RIOTS OF JUNE 5, 1917, AT JOLIET PRISON

As the bad effects of the policy of a previous management which was responsible for what occurred at the prison on June 5, 1917, has been overcome, we have turned our attention to the possibilities for the future. Fortunately, Illinois had previously planned to build a new prison. The firm of Zimmerman, Saxe, & Zimmerman, who are preparing the plans, spent months and years studying what prison construction should be. They have been all over the world studying, and as a result, Illinois now has a plan for prison construction far in advance of any plan in the world. Some of the buildings are up now, and nearly three hundred prisoners are already on the site in one of the new buildings. It is the intention to so far complete the buildings within two years as to permit of the abandonment of the old prison altogether while the balance of the construction work is going on.

The "Illinois idea" of prison management is to first bring about the sort of classification of prisoners that will make it possible to give individual attention and possibly treatment where it is needed—a classification that will enable prisoners to make such progress toward fitting themselves for citizenship as they are inclined to make, with the assistance of the prison officials.

Illinois has approved, adopted, and put into operation as far as possible with facilities at hand, a Progressive Merit System, a thing that can be made perfectly visible to prisoners, and be an encouragement to them in fitting themselves for freedom.

STATE IS BUILDING A NEW PRISON

Illinois is now constructing a new prison, a prison that will lend itself to carrying out the "Illinois idea" of prison management. Inside the prison walls the construction provides for at least four distinct classes of prisoners, with opportunities for them to adapt themselves to a Progressive Merit System.

The first section of the prison to which prisoners, when they are committed, are assigned, is the hospital section where all are examined thoroughly as to their mental and physical condition. Those who are in normal condition pass quickly into the next section. Those in need of continued observation remain in the first section until treatment is no longer necessary, and then they pass to the next section. Those, who because of their mental deficiency, are not capable of adapting themselves to the Progressive Merit System are segregated, cared for, and treated in quarters where adequate facilities are provided for such cases, and these quarters are situated entirely separate from the other portion of the prison.

In the second section of the prison, prisoners are kept under rigid discipline, in safe and secure quarters, effectually separated from the other sections. Prisoners here are under close observation and are given no responsibility. However, their inclination to adapt themselves to habits of industry, and to be amenable to discipline, is observed. It would be possible

for those who have an ambition to do well, and to make such a record as would justify favorable consideration to be given them later on, to work out of this section in a few weeks. Others will have to be inspired to entertain such an ambition. They may so conduct themselves as to be promoted to the next section; but when given some responsibilities, fail, it will then be necessary to demote them, with an opportunity to again make an effort to adapt themselves to the progressive ideas.

Some of them have lived practically all their lives in vicious surroundings, and know nothing about the side of life that would enable them to be good citizens. Unfortunately, they must learn that in prison; and they should also be taught how to respect the laws.

WHERE FIRST CONSIDERATION OF PAROLE IS GIVEN

In the third section the larger number of prisoners are kept, and it is necessary to keep some of them a long period of time. It is in this section that they first get consideration by the Division of Pardons and Paroles. In other words, it is while they are in this section that they are given a hearing by the Division of Pardons and Paroles, who judge from the inclination already shown by the prisoner, and the record he has made on the outside, how long it will probably take for him to fit himself for parole. In this section, the construction of buildings provides for prisoners being given the opportunity of demonstrating their reliability, as more and more responsibility is placed upon them. It is while in this section that it is concluded by the officials of the Division of Pardons and Paroles and by the Division of Prisons, not alone how long the prisoner should stay in prison as a punishment for the crime that has been committed, but how much time it will take to fit him to be a proper recipient of the provisions of the parole law. The progress he makes in this section will demonstrate his ability to adapt himself, by degrees, not only to community life in the prison, but to the rules of society outside the prison. The plans for the new prison call for four cell houses in this section, each with different interior construction, which affords a varying degree of restraint.

Prisons in the past have been built with cell houses providing the security necessary to hold the most desperate or hardened prisoners, not taking into account the fact that such security is not necessary in all cases, and if men are to be fit for good citizenship, there comes a time even while in prison, when it is no longer necessary to house them in such cells as are provided for the most desperate. However, this section is within the walls of the prison, and the cell houses, even as prisoners are graduated from one to the other, are all secure, so far as escape from prison is concerned.

ALL BUT FEW PRISONERS MUST RETURN TO SOCIETY

With the exception of a small per cent of a prison population, all prisoners are some time to be returned to society, and with this thought in mind, the "Illinois idea" is to fit prisoners for ultimate parole so that there is opportunity for them to become good citizens. However, it is not contemplated that prisoners shall be placed on their honor at that time, and probably not wholly upon their honor until they have progressed through the entire system and are fit subjects for parole. Nor is it contemplated that prisoners shall be placed in such a position as to govern themselves in prison. However, it is intended that the Progressive Merit System will assist in every way possible to ultimately make of them honorable men, fit to govern themselves when finally released.

With this idea in mind, some prisoners, as they make progress, will be assigned to a section of the prison which is laid out much as a small village is laid out, with cottages instead of cell houses; the groups of buildings to be within the enclosure; but not a high wall, such as surrounds the balance of the prison. Here prisoners, while yet under control of the prison officials, learn how to live a community life and respect the rights of others and get ideas of the rights and duties of citizenship. When prisoners have progressed in the merit system so that they are eligible to pass out of this section, they are assigned to the farm, where there is no suggestion of prison

walls, bars, or barriers, but where there is supervision given in the way that supervisors look after a large farm. When men leave the farm they go out on parole, having, by their own efforts, justified such consideration as gives them the benefits of the provisions of the parole law.

I beg your pardon for taking up so much of your time and want to thank you for the opportunity that has been afforded us to come here today to discuss this subject.

THE PAROLE LAW AND ITS ADMINISTRATION

[By Judge J. E. McClure, Assistant Director of the Department of Public Welfare.]

Note: Judge McClure has had many years experience in connection with the penal institutions of the state of Illinois. As Assistant Director of the Department of Public Welfare he was assigned by the director of the department as an associate of the Superintendent of the Division of Pardons and Paroles in the administration of the parole aw. The following address was delivered before the Hamilton Club of the city of Chicago, December 19, 1919, in response to an invitation from that club.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Hamilton Club: Public officials who seek honestly and sincerely to administer their duties faithfully and in the interests of the people ought to be and usually are glad of an opportunity to tell of their stewardship.

The administration of the penal and reformatory institutions of Illinois containing, as they do, about 4,000 inmates is a work requiring ability, honesty of purpose and a broad-minded vision of the great objects to be attained. You have listened to the address on prison management by the superintendent of prisons, the man who by executive appointment is charged with the immediate responsibility of the administration of these great institutions. I have known John L. Whitman a great many years by reputation, but I have been privileged to enjoy his personal acquaintance for only two and one-half years, but in that time I have learned to know him well. As so many of you know, he is a man of uncompromising honesty, actuated in all that he does by a high sense of honor, and endowed with a real vision and a real understanding of the big problems in the big work he is called upon to do. His work as superintendent of prisons is so closely indentified with that of the Division of Pardons and Paroles that it is eminently proper for both of these subjects to be considered at the same time. So close is their relationship that the success of the one depends in large measure upon the success of the other. I am happy to say that the very closest co-operation exists between the Division of Pardons and Paroles and the Division of Prisons.

The results, as we view them, furnish a splendid illustration of the many and lasting benefits derived from the co-operative system of government now in such successful operation in Illinois.

I do not know what features of the parole law and its administration you most desire information about, but with your permission and your indulgence I shall tell you briefly something of the work and forms of procedure of the Division of Pardons and Paroles. And I shall do this in the hope that it may give you a little clearer insight into the administration of a law which sometimes is misunderstood or misjudged.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE DIVISION

As now constituted, the Division of Pardons and Paroles is presided over by one person designated and known as the Superintendent of Pardons and Paroles. That superintendent is Will Colvin, who is now entering upon his seventh year's experience in this work. To him, more than anyone else, is due the credit for the recent improvements in and the enlargement of the scope of the parole work. He has two assistants who ably help him in his ever enlarging activities. By order of the Director of the Department of Public Welfare, who has complete control and supervision of the work

of the division, the assistant director and the superintendent of prisons are associated with the superintendent of pardons and paroles in an advisory capacity.

TWO LINES OF WORK BEFORE THE DIVISION

There are two separate lines of work coming before this division but which are really intimately related. One is the matter of commutation or pardon and the other is that of parole. For the hearing of application for commutation or pardon there are four sessions annually, namely: January, April, July and October. In the neighborhood of 400 cases of this kind are heard each year by the board. These sessions are held at Springfield. Rules are made and promulgated by the division under which all such applications are made.

GREATEST INTEREST IS IN PAROLE WORK

But it is in the matter of parole that the greatest interest is manifested. Monthly meetings are held at the two penitentiaries and at the Pontiac reformatory for the consideration of cases. Nearly an entire week is spent in this work in each institution each month. The hours spent are far in excess of what is generally recognized as a day. The form of procedure in each institution is the same. A regular docket is prepared by the officers of the institution of all prisoners who are to appear for a hearing.

Let me explain at this time that all commitments to the penitentiaries and reformatory are for an indeterminate period except for the crimes of treason, murder, rape and kidnapping. In those four cases the jury is required to fix a definite term of imprisonment. It will be readily seen, therefore, that the very great number of persons who are incarcerated in prison, are under indeterminate sentences. Under the law, except in a very few cases such as robbery with a weapon and horse stealing, the minimum sentence is one year. Accordingly, a first termer, i. e., a prisoner who has not previously been incarcerated in any other prison or reformatory, automatically comes before the board at the end of eleven months, which is the minimum term of his imprisonment, less the statutory good time earned. Each case is given careful attention. The court officials, the prison officials, and others identified with the work, furnish the division with all possible available information relating to the inmate. The prisoner appears personally before the division. He is treated courteously and kindly. He is interrogated and is permitted to make any statements he desires to make. When the examination of the prisoner is ended, and he retires from the room, the board then frankly and without reserve discuss his case. They then determine whether he shall be paroled, and if not, what length of time he shall be retained in prison. It should be borne in mind that only a comparative few of those who appear are paroled. In the month of December, 1919, twenty-eight men were paroled from Pontiac, and eighteen from Joliet. The Chester meeting has not yet been held. Every prisoner in every institution has an opportunity to make his statement and present his case.

ALL THINGS ARE CONSIDERED

At these hearings the health, mental as well as physical, of every prisoner appearing is inquired into. If there be doubt as to his mentality, the division invokes the co-operative assistance of the state's criminologist. The case is continued, pending a thorough special examination by that official. The prison physician furnishes all needed information relative to the physical condition of the prisoner. In passing upon the case, due consideration is given to the behavior and conduct of the prisoner while in the institution as well as to his attitude of mind when he appears before the board.

TO SATISFY THE DEMANDS OF SOCIETY

The great problem which confronts these persons entrusted with this work is to see that the prisoner is retained in prison long enough to satisfy the demands of society and to be assured, so far as finite minds can be

assured that, when released, the prisoner is in that mental attitude and is possessed of that strength of character that he is fit to go out upon parole. So much for those who are automatically eligible for hearing upon application for parole.

The rules of the board prescribe that a second termer cannot appear before the division until he shall have served 21 months; a third termer cannot appear until he shall have served 30 months; a fourth termer until he shall have served 38 months. This rule, which we regard as sound and just is predicated upon the belief that repeated offenders must, and of right ought to be retained in the institution a proportionately greater length of time than first offenders, before they appear before the division.

HOW HEARINGS ARE SECURED BY PRISONERS

At every meeting every month there are many other cases which come before the division. A prisoner may secure a hearing by writing a letter. That letter is carefully read, and if there be anything in it which would suggest that the prisoner should be heard, he is called up for a special hearing and his case reviewed. He tells what he has in mind and due consideration is given it. There are many of such cases each month. Sometimes the whole conduct and attitude of the prisoner has so changed that the division feel that the final given him, at a meeting months or even years previously, may, with justice to society and benefit to the prisoner be reduced, and it sometimes is reduced. Such action, if taken, is a part of the big scheme of prison management which is based upon the principle that it is the duty of all identified with the handling and care and custody of prisoners to do all needed things to fit those prisoners for right living and good citizenship when they shall leave the prison, and to release them when they are fit.

It may be of interest to you to know that at each one of these hearings, each month, there are approximately 150 cases considered. It means work; it means long hours; but it pays if it results in reclaiming hitherto wayward men and placing them on a footing so that henceforth they will obey the law and live decent lives.

LISTENING TO APPEALS OF FRIENDS

At each monthly parole hearing there is one day given up entirely to listening to the appeals of friends and relatives of prisoners. It is known as "visitors' day." Wives, mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters and children come and are sometimes accompanied by attorneys to make an appeal to the division for loved ones in the institution. Pathetic stories of suffering and untold hardships are told. It is oftentimes a heartrending experience never looked forward to with pleasure by members who hear these appeals, but it is an experience which they must face. Naturally, there are many who appeal for relatives or friends for whom nothing can be done, but the story is heard; the statement is taken in shorthand, and later transcribed and made a part of the record in the case, and due consideration given to it. At these public hearings the fact stands out that the father may and frequently does disown the son, but the mother never loses confidence in her boy, and with a heart filled with love, she oftentimes declares that while her boy has been bad in the past he is now thoroughly changed and that if he could be given another chance he will henceforth live an honorable and upright life. Month after month the division hear these pathetic appeals; they listen to all the petitioners with courtesy and kindness; but, throughout those trying ordeals as well as in all their other work, the division is ever mindful of the fact that it has a double duty to perform; one to society and one to the unfortunate inmates whose liberty they hold within their power.

CARE IN SELECTING THE MAN'S SPONSOR

When the man is ordered paroled and the term to be done upon parole fixed, then the utmost care is exercised in the selection of his sponsor. Someone must sign his papers and see to it that he makes his reports

regularly every month and that he behaves himself in accordance with the rules of the division. That's the last step in the system.

In selecting a sponsor the letter of the statute is followed: "No prisoner shall be released from either the penitentiary or reformatory until the Department of Public Welfare shall have made arrangements or shall have satisfactory evidence that arrangements have been made for his or her honorable and useful employment while upon parole in some suitable occupation and, also, for a proper and suitable home, free from criminal influences." Prisoners are released on parole ordinarily for a period of twelve months. It is within the power of the division to extend that time, and in a number of instances they have done so. Oftentimes it is to the advantage of the prisoner to require him to do two, three, four, or even five years upon parole.

SPONSOR INVESTIGATED BY PAROLE AGENTS

Proposed sponsors are investigated by parole agents and surroundings and environments of the place into which the parolee is to go are thoroughly inspected. If the proposed sponsor does not measure up to the requirements, then the man is kept in prison until some responsible sponsor is found. The utmost care is now exercised in that feature of the work. There have been failures in the past because of this lack of supervision and inspection.

A suitable sponsor having been found and the papers properly executed, the man is released from the institution. The parole supervisor, in charge of that work, gives the parolee final instructions which are accompanied by a friendly talk and words of encouragement, and then the man goes out to do his parole.

REAL AND EFFECTIVE SUPERVISION SINCE JULY 1, 1919

Prior to July 1, 1919, there was no real and effective means for helpful supervision of men on parole, but a wise and comprehensive plan was evolved by the superintendent of pardons and paroles, and so impressed were the members of the general assembly with it that they not only enacted it into law but authorized the employment of an extra number of parole agents and provided needed appropriations.

"After care" is now a reality. Paroled men can go out under the best possible conditions. They go to good employment at remunerative wages. They are assured of a real and genuine friendly interest in their welfare. Twenty active energetic and broadminded parole agents know where the parolees are day and night.

Under the new plan the state is divided into ten districts. Each is in charge of a parole agent who visits each man on parole in his district at least once a month and in some instances many times oftener. District No. 1 comprises the counties of Cook, Stevenson, Ogle, Winnebago, Boone, DeKalb, Kane, McHenry, Lake and DuPage counties.

THE SUPERVISION IN CHICAGO

Because it includes the great city of Chicago, six agents look after the parolees in District No. 1. They have offices in the county building. Whenever a man is released on parole into Chicago, he reports to the parole office when he reaches the city and is required to make frequent visits thereafter. The parole agents know where everyone of the men on parole in Chicago is working in the day time and where he is sleeping at night. What's true of that district is equally true of every other district in the state. I wish time would premit me to elaborate upon this great scheme of "after-care" and observation. One important feature of it I must refer to and that is the splendid co-operation received from the police departments in Chicago. Less than one year ago, after a number of conferences, an arrangement was effected between Chief Garrity and the Division of Pardons and Paroles, the success of which has been even greater than the gentlemen who were parties to it had hoped. It may be interesting to you to know that there are now six sergeants of police of the city of Chicago, all splendid men and

all in genuine sympathy with the principles of the parole law, who are especially detailed to co-operate with the parole agents in the administration of the parole law here in Chicago. The police department, as well as the parole agents, are now acquainted with the name and residence and place of employment of every man on parole in Chicago and co-operating together as they are, the certain result is that the interests of society are protected to the utmost, and the welfare of the well-intentioned parolee who is putting forth an honest effort to make good is abundantly safe-guarded. The same system of co-operation between the police department and the Division of Pardons and Paroles existing in Chicago also obtains in Peoria, Rock Island, Springfield and East St. Louis.

DEFINITE SENTENCE PAROLE

In the brief time allotted, I cannot go into another phase of the work which is now known as "definite sentence parole." It is the same as the ordinary parole except that the man serving a definite sentence may, in the discretion of the division, be released upon parole for the maximum of his sentence, after he has served one-third of the sentence, provided that one-third is equal to the minimum sentence under which the prisoner is committed.

Since the enactment of the definite sentence parole act there have been a total of 76 inmates paroled from the Chester prison who are received under a definite sentence, three of whom violated their parole and were returned, and three violated and are still at large.

NINETY-SIX UNDER DEFINITE SENTENCE AT JOLIET

There have been a total of 96 inmates paroled from Joliet who were received under a definite sentence, only two of whom have violated and are still at large.

The Department of Public Welfare believes in the parole law. It is not unmindful of the fact that there are those who oppose it and those who feel that its administration has not resulted in that degree of success which its advocates predicted. There are those who conscientiously believe that if the parole law were what its friends proclaim it to be that crime would be very materially decreased and that necessity for police officers and for courts and jails and penitentiaries would not be so apparent as at this time. No honest officials can claim perfection for themselves, and neither should fair-minded people expect that men will cease to steal and to rob and to kill simply because it is unlawful to steal and rob and kill; but the Department of Public Welfare does believe that the records show that the parole law has been a success and that this success has not been half-way nor even questionable, and that as administered it is good and not bad for the public weal.

Let me submit to you, for your candid consideration and judgment, some statistics which I hope will be interesting and enlightening:

FIRST TERMERS OF JOLIET PRISON

For the ten years from 1886 to 1895 inclusive, 7,440 prisoners were received at the Joliet prison. Of that number 6,389, or 86 per cent were first termers—meaning that no one of the 6,389 had served in a penal institution or a reformatory either in Illinois or any other state.

For the ten years from 1909 to 1918 inclusive, 5,081 prisoners were received at the Joliet prison. Of that number 4,483, or 88 per cent were first termers.

In other words, there were received at Joliet during the ten years from 1886 to 1895, 2,359 more prisoners than were received during the ten years from 1909 to 1918.

In the year 1918 a total of 461 prisoners were received at Joliet as against 961 received in the year 1895. In other words, after a period of twenty-three years the total number received at Joliet was exactly 500 less in 1918 than it was in 1895.

FIRST TERMERS IN 1918

Of the 461 received in 1918, 410 or 89 per cent were first termers. Of the 961 received in 1895, 792, or 82 per cent were first termers.

These figures definitely and conclusively refute the often repeated statement in Cook county that 90 per cent of the crime there is committed by persons upon parole.

In further substantiation of this statement, your attention is directed to the record of indictments returned by the Cook couny grand jury in December, 1918 and January, 1919. By that body 1,034 indictments were returned of which 9 were against men on parole. Five of these were from Joliet and four from Pontiac.

Of the five from Joliet, only one was convicted and returned upon new sentence; of the four from Pontiac two were convicted and returned upon new sentences.

Under the parole system, the time served is substantially twice as long as it was under the definite sentence law as is clearly demonstrated by the following statistics:

COMPARISONS: DEFINITE AND INDEFINITE SENTENCES

Last five years of definite sentence (1890 to 1895) compared with last five years of indeterminate sentence (1914 to 1919) for the crimes of burglary, larceny and robbery at the Joliet prison.

	Average for five years, 1890 to 1895—by jury			Average for five years, 1914 to 1919—by board		
	Years	Months	Days	Years	Months	Days
Burglary	1	7	21	2	9	21
Larceny	1	4	14	2	1	13
Robbery	1	9	6	2	7	23
Average	1	6	28	2	6	18
Second term inmates	2		27	4	2	21
Third term inmates	2	6	20	4	11	18

For the five years 1890 to 1895 the jury gave the maximum in only 17 cases in which the average time served was six years, seven months and eighteen days.

For the years 1916 to 1920 the board gave the maximum in 162 cases in which the average time to be served is eight years, three months and thirteen days.

Note—Prisoners with records are doing the long service. The average for second termers is more than doubled as is also the average for third termers while in 490 cases, including repeaters and bad crimes, the average runs up to eight years and three months.

REPORT FOR NOVEMBER, 1919, IN DISTRICT NO. 1

The parole agent in charge of the Chicago office made the following report for the month of November:

Total number of men on parole from Joliet, Nov. 1, 1919 126
Total number of men on parole from Pontiac, Nov. 1, 1919 86
Total number of men on parole from Chester, Nov. 1, 1919 7

Total 219

Total number of men discharged from Joliet during month 21
Total number of men discharged from Pontiac during month 7
Total number of men discharged from Chester during month 0

Total 28

Total number of men declared violators and not apprehended J.	0	
Total number of men declared violators and not apprehended P.	2	
Total number of men declared violators and not apprehended C.	0	
Total		2
Total number of men returned to Joliet	3	
Total number of men returned to Pontiac	1	
Total number of men returned to Chester	0	
Total		4
Total deductions		34
Total less deductions		185
Total number of men received from Joliet	6	
Total number of men received from Pontiac	12	
Total number of men received from Chester	0	
Total received for month		18
		203

FIGURES AS TO REPEATERS

Doubtless there are among you some who conscientiously believe that the definite sentence is more effective in preventing crime than the parole system. Permit me to submit these figures as to "repeaters" received under the two systems:

Statement showing a comparison of recommitments of inmates to the Illinois State Penitentiary for the year ending 1894 to 1895 under the definite sentence law, and for five years under the parole law.

Recommitments	Second Term	Third Term	Fourth Term	Fifth Term	Sixth Term	Total	Per cent
From July 1, 1894 to June 30, 1895	113	36	13	5	2	169	17.58
Total number of inmates received						961	
Daily count July 1, 1895						1,677	
From October 1, 1910 to September 30, 1911	53	11	3	4		71	16.98
Total number of inmates received						418	
Daily count October 1, 1911						1,347	
From October 1, 1911 to September 30, 1912	36	9	1			46	12.11
Total number of inmates received						380	
Daily count October 1, 1912						1,371	
From October 1, 1912 to September 30, 1913	46	7	2	1	1	57	10.96
Total number of inmates received						521	
Daily count October 1, 1913						1,525	
From October 1, 1913 to September 30, 1914	35	7				42	6.46
Total number of inmates received						650	
Daily count October 1, 1914						1,618	

INVITING CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

Mr. President and Gentlemen, let me call your attention to another matter. You are successful business and professional men, taxpayers of the state, all interested deeply in public affairs. We are public officials charged with big responsibilities. You and we should have a common interest. Let us be frank one with the other. We invite honest, unselfish, construc-

tive criticism. We welcome such criticism whether it comes from within the state or from some distant state, but we have a right to demand that it be founded upon facts.

CRIME WAVES IN CHICAGO

Now, from time to time it is charged in the public press and otherwise that crime in the city of Chicago is committed largely by men upon parole. The Department of Public Welfare is not shirking any responsibility nor seeking to avoid any deserved liability. The department is willing to bear all the blame for the failures which may be properly charged against it. We know that there are and will continue to be failures by men on parole. Human nature is not perfect, neither is any human institution perfect. But the 85 or 90 per cent of paroled men who do make good should not have the shortcomings of others charged against them. Has it ever occurred to you that sometimes when paroled men are mentioned that men on probation are meant? I am from far down the state. I am not well acquainted with conditions in this great city of Chicago but I do know that in the section where I live parole and probation are often confounded. Sometimes even our judges and state's attorneys and others, including editors, and I belong to the latter class, say parole when they mean probation. That same condition may obtain in Chicago. Let me impress upon you that the Division of Pardons and Paroles and the Department of Public Welfare have nothing whatever to do with probation. We assume all responsibility in connection with the men on parole in Cook county but if any of the 5,000 or 8,000 men who are on probation should commit crimes and be indicted, the Division of Pardons and Paroles cannot and in fairness and justice ought not to be held accountable for that. Until the present cooperative arrangement was entered into with the Chicago police department, the Daily Bulletin issued by the department of police of this city used parole instead of probation. Here is an illustration. I have the bulletin of November 5, 1914. In that bulletin are listed twenty cases of offenders who were released on probation the day before in Chicago. At the head of that list are these words: "Paroled from Municipal Court." That injustice to the parole law has been corrected. In all the bulletins now issued the list of those released on probation is headed, "On probation from Criminal Court."

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PAROLE AND PROBATION

I trust I am within the proprieties of the occasion when I appeal to you to join a movement to bring about a clear and distinct understanding of the difference between parole and probation. This you can do in the interest of every paroled man who is making an honest effort to lead a straight life, and you can, and I believe you will, do this in fairness and in justice to the men who are endeavoring to administer the parole law according to the spirit of that law. But over and above all it should be done in justice to the system itself. It matters not as to the personnel of the administrators of the parole law. We, the present administrators, succeeded others; others will succeed us; but the principle of the parole law is right and ought to be sustained.

DEPARTMENT HAS NOTHING TO CONCEAL

The Department of Public Welfare has nothing to hide. There are no dark and mysterious secrets about the administration of the parole law or the state institutions. John L. Whitman, E. J. Murphy, James A. White, James F. Scouller and Will Colvin are high class prison men, conscientious in what they do, sympathetic in their nature, and devoting their time and their talents toward the accomplishment of the great duty imposed upon them by the Illinois statute, which directs them to so care for the prisoners incarcerated in the prisons and reformatory "as shall prevent those prisoners from returning to criminal courses, best secure their self-support, and accomplish their reformation."

In conclusion permit me to say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that if you are interested in this subject and care to acquaint yourself more fully

with the methods of procedure before the Division of Pardons and Paroles, I invite you to attend any meeting of the parole board at either of the penitentiaries or the reformatory, sit in with the members of the division and observe and study the subject at close range. Those meetings are necessarily quasi private, because the great purpose of the personal interview with the prisoner, is to secure his innermost thoughts and to ascertain his real attitude of mind, and that is most certain of accomplishment when he is face to face with the parole board and no one else. But the rule is set aside when citizens come who really want to see and learn. If you cannot come, appoint a committee, limited to two or three or five, and we will extend to you or to them, or both, a cordial welcome and take real pleasure in explaining our work in detail.

I thank you most sincerely for the privilege of appearing before you, and I appeal to you to give this whole subject of prison management and the administration of the parole law serious, thoughtful consideration, and if you can conscientiously do so, we will be very grateful if you will give us your support and your cordial co-operation in the work we are trying to do.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES CONTRIBUTED BY MR. WHITMAN

Note: Following a series of attacks upon the parole law by certain Chicago newspapers, the Chicago Daily News invited John L. Whitman, Superintendent of the Division of Prisons, to prepare a series of articles for publication in that newspaper. The Daily News also published an editorial endorsing the parole law, which editorial is the first article in this series. The subsequent articles were contributed by Mr. Whitman.

PAROLE AS VIEWED FROM THE BENCH

From an eminent judge of a Cook county court The Daily News has received a letter expressing appreciation of the views favorable to the Illinois parole law recently presented in these columns. "That the law," writes this correspondent, "is based upon sound principles and provides a system which is vastly better in many ways than the old system is something which, to my mind, cannot be successfully denied and will not be by reasonable persons who know the facts."

The state's attorney of Cook county, however, is bitterly hostile to the parole law. In this connection it may be well to call attention to the fact that the organization of state's attorneys of Illinois has adopted the opposite view of the law and its administration. The correspondent already quoted presents this testimony in regard to the working of the parole law:

"The attitude of the state's attorney toward this law—and his attitude seems to have the support of at least a part of the press—is completely refuted by the statistics having to do with crime and criminals, both before the law went into effect and since that time. As The Daily News has pointed out, about 85 or 90 per cent of the parole cases show entirely satisfactory results. One would think from the attitude of Mr. Hoyne that his staff was kept busy convicting paroled men of felonies committed by them while on parole. Nothing could be further from the truth. These cases are suprisingly rare and when one does occur a huc and cry is raised against the parole law, but the public never hears of the hundred cases where men who have gone to the penitentiary—generally for a first offense—have been given their chance to 'come back' under provisions of the parole act and have made good."

So much for the law broadly speaking and especially for the theory of systemized friendly help along the road to reform that underlies the law. But it is not a perfect law, and, particularly in the past, there have been lamentable errors in its administration. This the correspondent concedes who writes to The Daily News in defense of the measure. He adds: "I think it might be wise to change those provisions of the act which permit successive paroles."

The parole system is, in short, good, but it ought to be made progressively better so long as there remains room for improvement.—Editorial.

CRIME AND THE PAROLE LAW

May 5, 1920

To support a new demand for the repeal of the parole law, or, at least for a restriction of its operation, State's Attorney Hoyne has published figures indicating that in the five years 1915-19, inclusive, 1,529 criminals were sent from Cook county to the Joliet penitentiary and 1,736 prisoners were paroled from that penitentiary to Cook county. According to Mr. Hoyne, paroled convicts are caught red-handed, time after time, engaged in the same sort of crimes for which they were originally sentenced and are reconvicted, only to be paroled once more. "Imagine," he says, "the state penitentiaries and reformatories turning felons back into the streets faster than our courts

are able to send them to the prisons. Police records show that the increase in crime is due to the presence of paroled convicts in our community."

Taken at face value and along with the frequently repeated assertion that 90 per cent of the crime in Chicago is committed by paroled convicts, Mr. Hoyne's figures would seem to indicate the futility of maintaining police to arrest criminals and courts to try them. However, his figures require analysis and explanation by supporters of the parole law. Meanwhile one may well view the other side of the picture. Officials of the Illinois Department of Public Welfare have published statistics which indicate that so-called crime waves in Chicago are not attributable to the operation of the parole law. For instance, of 491 prisoners received at Joliet penitentiary in 1918, just 410, or 89 per cent, were first termers—persons who never had served prison terms. Of the 1,034 indictments returned by the Cook county grand jury in December, 1918, and January, 1919, only nine were against paroled convicts and of those only three were convicted and returned to prison on new sentences.

Proceeding on the theory that all but a small percentage of the prison population must be returned at some time to society, the prison officials, working under the "Illinois idea," seek to fit them for upright living. Only after they have passed through the prescribed observations and tests do they become eligible to parole and when released they are subject to a system of "after-care" under the direction of the State Department of Public Welfare. In Chicago six specially detailed sergeants of police co-operate in exercising that care.

Undoubtedly there have been mistakes and abuses in the administration of the parole law. Therefore it requires improvement. Some criminals who should have been kept in the penitentiary have been released and have committed new crimes. However, the sessions of the pardon board are not secret. The co-operation of the courts is asked and received and doubtless any information which a representative of the state's attorney could give would be welcome. But, as the men who administer it insist, the parole law should not be condemned because of the failures of some men on parole and the 85 or 90 per cent who do not return to criminal practices should not suffer for the shortcoming of the few.

TOUCHING THE HUMAN SIDE OF THINGS

THE LETTER OF THE LAW

June 2, 1920

"The fall guy" confesses. He is indicted, tried, convicted and sentenced to serve one to fourteen years in the Illinois State Penitentiary. A man has been deprived of his liberty, as a punishment for a crime against the state, against society, as provided by law. The letter of the law has been observed for "the fall guy" goes to Joliet and enters the rattan shop.

Some day his time will be served. "The fall guy" will be given $10, a new suit of clothes and a railroad ticket, free to go among free men again, How shall he go? As a man vindictive, with a heart black with hatred, aching and bursting for revenge? Or shall he go as a man happy again to be free, a man resolved to take a decent man's place in society, to a decent man's part in the upholding of that society?

In this series of articles I want to tell the story of "the fall guy," who is not an individual, but a composite of all the men who, for various reasons, become of that group known as "the criminal class," who go to prison and then again go out of prison back to society.

A few weeks ago State's Attorney Maclay Hoyne was quoted in the newspapers as saying that there were more men paroled to Cook county from the Joliet penitentiary than were committed from this county to that institution. Mr. Hoyne gave figures which indicated that from 1915 to the first of this year a total of 1,529 men had been sentenced to Joliet from Cook

county and 1,736 had been paroled. These figures, used as an attack against the parole system that is in force now in Illinois, are employed as an argument to show why Mr. Hoyne thinks the parole law should be repealed. He says that most of the crime committed in Chicago and Cook county is committed by paroled men.

Mr. Hoyne's figures are incorrect. According to the records of the Illinois State Penitentiary, statistics were prepared by William Wickersham, recorder of the institution, which shows for the five years that 1,539 persons were received at the institution from Cook county and 1,218 were paroled; that the average time served by these men was two years, eleven months, eighteen days.

The Cook county grand jury for last March, following the lead of the state's attorney, condemned the parole law. In indicting 336 for crimes that had been committed the grand jury stated in its report that 90 per cent of the crime committed in Cook county was traceable to paroled men. The Division of Pardons and Paroles of the State Department of Public Welfare studied and analyzed this report and looked up the records in each case.

Of the 336 men indicted a checking of every case found the following to be correct: Of the men on parole there were two from Joliet and three from Pontiac, 1.49 per cent of the total indictments; nine had received final discharges from parole, or 2.68 per cent; fifteen had served in the house of correction (the bridewell), 4.46 per cent; five were on probation from the courts, 1.49 per cent; nine were paroled from other states, 2.68 per cent; the remaining 293, or 87.20 per cent, were without record of any kind.

Of the five on parole from the two Illinois institutions one has been tried and found not guilty, another was tried and his case was stricken off. Cases of the three others are still pending in the courts.

Due to the fact the police here freely blame most crime upon paroled men, we went to Chief of Police Garrity and had him assign six policemen to work out of the office of the chief parole agent here. The police had blamed 90 per cent of Cook county crime upon paroled men, as did the March grand jury. The constitutional convention asked Chief Garrity after these six men had been working out of the parole agent's office for some time for a report as to the crime committed by paroled men. The report given to the convention by Chief Garrity, which had been prepared by Sergeant Michael Hogan, senior of the six policemen working from the parole agent's office, showed that 13 per cent of the paroled men had failed in living up to their paroles—which means a lesser percentage of crime committed by paroled men.

"The fall guy" goes back to society some day. He goes as a man who has served all of his time, who has been pardoned or paroled. He has a pretty hard row to hoe if every man's hand is against him, especially the hands of the police and the state's attorneys. He can very well be driven again to crime by hounding of the police or the prosecutor and thus to a violation of his parole if he is a paroled man. He can be made a good citizen if given the chance. And all "the fall guy" needs is a fair chance.

THE SPIRIT OF THE LAW

June 3, 1920

The letter of the law says that one who commits a crime against society shall be punished. This is justice. Until we reach a utopian condition of being we shall have persons committing offenses against the people and enduring punishment as a deterrent to other criminality. But there is a something which relieves the harshness of our non-utopian condition and that is the spirit of the law.

The letter of the law says "Punish." The spirit of the law says "Reconstruct."

Only the criminal who is executed passes out of the pale of society for all time. Even the "life termers," under the letter of the law, have the

chance here in Illinois of regaining their freedom. The letter of the law is concerned only with their punishment. When they are punished the letter of the law is satisfied. But not until their punishment does the spirit of the law enter. The spirit of the law says that when they are punished society is satisfied, that they have paid their debt and may again enter free life.

Here is Illinois, which possesses the world's most advanced statutes in regard to paroles and pardons, the spirit of the law may best be expressed by our parole regulations, which permit the prisoner, after he has served a minimum of his sentence, to return to society under surveillance, on his own honor. The law here has been a success. Wherever it has been tried it has been a success. There is a percentage of failure, of course, but should the great majority of success be condemned because of the failure of the few? The parole is being administered in Illinois now to great advantage and under such supervision as allows actual knowledge of what the paroled man is doing. The parole board, the state's attorney, the police—all have intimate knowledge of the action of the paroled man at all times.

Since January 1, 1920, there have been 129 men released on parole, forty-eight of whom were released to the first district, which is composed of the twelve northern counties of the state, including Cook. One violation has been reported among these forty-eight. On May 19, 1920, 280 men were on parole throughout the state, 137 of them in the first district. Since January 1, there were a total of eleven violations of the first district, and seven of the men were returned to the prison at Joliet. That is a pretty good record. Those violations do not mean a return of the men to crime. They indicate, for the most part, a failure to keep away from bad companions, a failure to remain at work, a failure, in short, to live up to the promises the man makes in effect when he is released from prison.

Confinement alone does not prepare a convicted man for citizenship. To the prisoner such confinement is mere punishment. The parole law is not concerned simply with releasing a man upon his honor, it contemplates giving him the correct viewpoint upon life. With proper supervision he becomes a good citizen. I cannot overestimate the importance of administering the laws so that the man will be made into a good citizen while in prison instead of simply being punished while there for his offense. Such is the spirit of the law.

WHAT A PAROLE LAW DOES

June 4, 1920

There is a general misunderstanding of what the parole law is and does. Under the statute a man sentenced to a limited term—say one to fourteen years—automatically is subject to parole when he has served the minimum of his sentence, one year in the case of the "one to fourteen" penalty. His case goes thus, automatically, to the parole board. There either he is admitted to parole or is refused and the board determines how much longer he is to serve.

If paroled, he must have a job outside before he is allowed to leave the prison. He may be paroled to the district from which he came; if he has a job and a sponsor in another district of the state he may be sent there. Usually the parole agent, who is notified of the allowance of parole, scours around and secures a job for the man, likewise a sponsor. The man is released and he reports to his sponsor. Then he reports to the parole agent. It is the duty of the parole agent to look up the man at stated intervals and report upon the man's action. At the termination of a year, if the man's actions have been blameless, he is given a final discharge.

That is the operation of the letter of the law again. The spirit of the law goes back to the man when he first enters the prison. He is examined by the prison physician, the psychologist, the psychiatrist and exact records of him are kept. At some later date he is called before the staff, which is composed of the three medical and psychological scientists; the warden and the assistant and deputies and one or all of the three prison guard captains. He is told the meaning of the parole law, what it does for him and his kind, what is expected of him if he is to expect in turn a parole when

his case comes up automatically for a parole hearing. He is examined by the staff, every word of which examination is taken by a clerk. That examination is filed in the man's jacket in the record office. He is under continual observation by every member of the staff from the time he enters until he is admitted to parole. He is given every opportunity to show that he desires earnestly to return to society as a "cured man."

The cases of "lifers" or men on definite sentences—say twenty-five years—do not come up for hearing automatically but the man may make written application for hearing after serving a definite period of his sentence. The lifer must serve technically twenty years of his time before he may petition for parole.

The state law fixes fourteen years as a minimum in the cases of definite sentences for murder. Thus, a man serving thirty years for murder may petition for parole or commutation of sentence when he has served the minimum, and the minimum in his case, by the terms of the "good time" law—good behavior during imprisonment—instead, of being fourteen years, becomes eight years and three months. In addition to serving the minimum he must serve one-third of his full time—thus, meeting all requirements of the law with its various allowances, the murderer sentenced to thirty years must serve ten full years before he can petition the board for consideration of his case. Then, if paroled, he must be on parole a number of years corresponding to the maximum of his sentence, less the "good-time" allowed by law. This would be, in the case of the thirty year man, ten full years of imprisonment and six years and three months on parole.

THE PRISON MERIT SYSTEM

June 7, 1920

Along with the lockstep, bread and water diet, the whipping post and—except in very rare instances—the solitary confinement, Illinois in its penal institutions has abolished what was known as "the honor system." There is no longer an honor system at the Joliet penitentiary.

It proved a failure. Now in its place is the merit system, by which the man's reliability is tested as he progresses toward parole, fitting himself for good citizenship. Classification, study, supervision of the men gives them such privileges by scientific methods rather than by a hit or miss method which takes a man's word for it, no matter what a scientific analysis of him may indicate as to his unworthiness for trust.

This eliminates one of the banes of penology—individualism.

The honor system said in, effect, "I am going to put you out on the farm where there are freight trains going by every hour or so; there will be no surveillance, nothing to keep you from hopping a train and getting away." To the prisoner it was the warden saying that to him. He was on honor to the warden. To the state he had no responsibility. Although it was the law which permitted the warden to allow him outside the walls, quite naturally the prisoner regarded the warden as the law.

When that prisoner left the penal institution to return to society he had no more idea of responsibility to the state than he had before. His idea of responsibility was one that rested in the policeman on the beat, the state's attorney in the criminal court building, the warden in the penitentiary. Therefore, we have reduced the responsibility to the individual and increased the sense of responsibility to the group at the penitentiary. He gets the idea so by degrees that it is the state, society at large, to which he will be indebted for his freedom.

The staff of the Joliet penitentiary, which I have referred to, is composed at the present time of Warden E. J. Murphy, Assistant Warden W. O. Hodgdon, Dr. W. R. Fletcher, prison physician; Dr. D. P. Phillips, psychiatrist; Dr. J. T. Metcalf, psychologist, and one or all of the three guard captains, M. J. Kane, F. L. Kness and L. F. Shotwell. The staff sits from 9 to 10 a. m. daily. Not only does it throughly explain the workings of the parole law and put questions to the man before it, but the man is encouraged to ask questions as to any phase of his stay in prison upon which his mind is not perfectly clear.

Thus, there are or there should be no misunderstandings between the prisoner and the staff. He is told just what he may or may not do; what is expected of him, how he may regain his freedom and how he must comport himself; what he must have learned before that freedom is given to him through operation in his case of the parole law.

THE PRISONERS' DAY

June 8, 1920

Look at the double line of convicts at the Joliet penitentiary going to their dining hall for supper in the evening after a day in the shops. They walk by twos, not in lock step, or even in military cadence. They talk and laugh—there is no penalty any more for talking. Years ago the uniform of stripes, so dear to the cartoonist when depicting convicts, was abolished. In its place is a suit of blue gray, a solid color woolen, with a cap of similar material.

They eat good food. Bread and water as a prison diet passed out years ago. The diet sheet, copies of which hang in the warden's office for any visitor to see, are very similar to diet sheets of the army. It is a scientifically balanced ration and every man gets plenty to eat. It is high-class food, well cooked. The rations now cost about 45 cents a day for each man. That is practically the wholesale cost of the food, as all handling and preparation are by convict labor.

The day begins at 7 a. m. and ends with lights out at 8 p. m.

Breakfast is at 7:30. The men work from 8 to 11:30 a. m. and have lunch at 11:35. After lunch they are locked in their cells until 1, when they again go to their work, where they remain until 4:30, the supper hour. After supper they again go to their cells, where they are locked in. There is a lot of time for reading and they are permitted to draw as many books as they wish from the prison library. Lights are not permitted after 8 o'clock, but they may read at noon and again after supper. The books these men draw are surprising. Fiction is demanded to some extent, but the great bulk of books demanded, especially since the parole law became effective, are works on trades, industries and so on. They are preparing themselves for parole. There are 25,000 volumes in that library and it is one of the most intensively circulated libraries in the world.

The chaplain conducts optional classes in a school for convicts. Many men have "matriculated" at the school as illiterates, to be paroled or discharged at the termination of their sentences with the ability at least to read and write. In some notable cases illiterates have learned English composition remarkably well.

I have in mind in this connection the case of a man who has served about twelve years of a life sentence for murder. Many Chicagoans will remember his case—how he tried to spirit out of an evil resort a girl he had married, how he was attacked by the landlady, how she was shot dead with her own pistol in the struggle that followed. He is a model prisoner. He has applied for commutation of sentence and the letters that he wrote to the parole board and to others interested in his case are well nigh perfect in composition, spelling and logic. He was virtually an illiterate when committed to the institution. He is a "trusty," working on the prison farm, a force for good among other prisoners there, for he is working hard for his own regeneration. He realizes that he is paying a debt to society, to the state, and he wants to return to society, for he believes he has paid his debt and may be placed again among free people without fear.

Men's own thoughts are their worst dangers. If we can direct those thoughts, especially in the long waking hours when they are locked in their cells; direct them into channels of reasoning, logic, on the situation they find themselves placed in, then we are accomplishing something toward their regeneration. If they are permitted to continue in their black thoughts of revenge upon the men responsible for placing them in prison, then they are getting no place.

SOME EFFECTS OF PAROLES

June 9, 1920

Condemnation of the Illinois parole law should be withheld at this time, if for no other reason than that it has really been in what I might term successful operation for only a year. The present rules controlling paroles were adopted July 1, 1917. Appropriations from the state legislature were small and the preparation of men for parole and supervision of them after parole were of necessity not up to the standards that the sponsors of the act wished. However, the agents and the few men they had on their staffs worked to such good effect that, by the opening of the 1919 session, the legislature was convinced of the efficacy of the plan. Agents and machinery were added.

Today a paroled man must have a job before he leaves the prison. His employer must know that he comes from a penitentiary. This is one thing we insist upon. Another thing upon which we are specific is that the employer shall not be permitted in any manner to hold a club over the paroled employe's head with the idea of forcing the man to do undesirable work or to accept less pay than others doing similar work. The man must have a square deal.

Of course there were paroles long before 1917, but such rules as are now in effect were unknown then.

Under the old parole laws and rules the man had little chance of keeping out of prison. Today he is safeguarded in every way possible. We have succeeded just within the last few months in obtaining a promise from the police not to include paroled men in general police dragnets after a big crime has been committed.

The well known dragnets are not needed for paroled men, because any one who wishes to know can find where a paroled man is at almost any time of the day or night. Formerly the man was hounded by the police, and perhaps he was driven into crime.

The reports of the prison staff which I have mentioned in the course of these articles as being intimate records of the prisoners from the time they enter the institution until they are considered for parole are invaluable to the parole board when considering the prisoner's case. If he has a mental age of 9 years when his body is 30 years old; if his mental reactions are negative; if he has the inability to reason for himself as against commission of crime then he is likely to remain in prison for a longer period, supplying thus a problem that criminologists confess is the most stubborn of all their problems. If, on the other hand, the man's record shows a normality of mind and an improved condition of mental reaction which should indicate the ability to "go straight" upon his release, then his parole is a matter of course.

The prison staff, with its psychologist, physician and psychiatrist; its criminologist and its trained observers in a lay sense, co-operating with the parole board, will eventually be able to say within a very small percentage of error whether a man, upon release, will go straight or return to criminal paths. If given the latitude of study we desire, the machinery to pursue those studies, the authority, then it will not be long until we can state almost definitely that this man may go free, and need not be watched, but this other man, when he has served his time, must be watched.

ONE WHO BROKE PAROLE

June 10, 1920

The parole board has recently given a final discharge to a man who was paroled in 1909. If I may digress for a moment and tell the story of this man I believe I can illustrate how the parole law works in some unusual circumstances.

This man, of whom I speak, was first sent to Joliet in 1908 for a minor offense. At the termination of his minimum of sentence he was paroled and he went to Chicago. He was not well known in the city and he in turn did not know the city well. Jobs were hard to find. The police were watching him and he had not been out of prison long before he was arrested as a vagrant, not as a criminal, and sent back to prison. He was released again. He simply could not find work and soon was out of money.

When he again returned to Chicago he realized that he was no better off than when first released from prison. He thought over his condition for a while and then violated his parole by leaving the state, going to California. For three years he worked on a steamer operating throughout the length and breadth of the Pacific ocean. He returned to this country and went to Europe on another job.

He was married and two children were born. He settled in another state and was a respected citizen. He was saving money, had a good bank account. But all the time there was preying upon his mind the fact that he was a fugitive from justice; he knew that he was wanted by the Illinois parole board for "jumping" his parole.

Finally, last year, he returned to this city and visited Major Messlein, the one who has helped so many down and outers through his connection with the Volunteers of America.

"What shall I do?" he asked Major Messlein, after having told his story.

"Have you any proof of what you have told me?" the major asked. The man smiled and produced a diary, kept every day of every year since he had left Chicago. It was a minute record of everything the man had done since leaving Chicago. It showed the money he had earned and spent. With it were his passports, his marriage certificate, birth certificates for his children. It was complete in every detail. Such documents as might require it were certified.

"Let us go before the pardon board and tell the story," Major Messlein suggested. The board, after considering the case from every angle, after looking over the man's diary, his proofs, extended him a final discharge. The man went back to his family with a great care and worry lifted from his mind. He knew then that his children would not suffer disgrace, for he can no longer be arrested as an escaped criminal and he is certain in his own mind that he never again will transgress.

NEW ILLINOIS PRISON RADICAL DEPARTURE

18TH AND 21ST CENTURIES IN PENAL INSTITUTIONS RUB SHOULDERS AT JOLIET

May 29, 1920

The eighteenth and twenty-first centuries are within three miles of each other in the Joliet district, in the matter of penal institutions, for standing in sight from the serried towers of the seventy-two years old Illinois State Penitentiary, little different from the institutions for the incarceration of criminals in the colonial period, is the first finished unit of the new penitentiary group at Stateville. This unit, a round cell house of four tiers, housing 248 inmates, designed to give ninety minutes of sunshine every day to every cell, is as radical a departure from the established architecture of penitentiaries as the limousine is from the palanquin in transformation.

From the Bastile to Sing Sing, from the stocks of Nanking to the prison farm of Joliet, from the knout to the kind word, W. Carbys Zimmerman, head of the architectural firm of Zimmerman, Saxe & Zimmerman, of 64 East Van Buren street, studied penology from every angle—the physical, architectural, hygienic, psychological, humane and reconstructive—to produce this new model penitentiary.

FIRST OF ITS KIND BUILT

It is needless to say this is the first thing of its kind in the world. Penologists, criminologists and architects specializing in public institutions from all parts of the country have viewed the new work at Stateville, have been given the drafting firm's figures and have gone away with new ideas in mind for the reconstruction of waste human material. Already the New York state building commission has adopted the idea of the wall that is to encircle the new group, scrapping designs that cost thousands of dollars to produce, in favor of these. Sing Sing is to be inclosed in a similar wall.

Stateville, roughly, is the 2,200 acres of fertile land two miles west of Lockport selected as the site for a new penitentiary by the commission appointed in 1909 by Gov. Charles S. Deneen, James A. Patten of Evanston, Ira C. Copley of Aurora and John Lambert of Joliet. The encroachment of the Illinois steel company's plants upon the present penitentiary at Joliet, the fact also that it has outgrown its present location, weighed heavily in a decision for a new institution.

SURROUNDED BY 33½ FOOT WALL

The 2,200 acres constitute the present prison farm. Directly in the center of this square parcel of land lies the new compound, sixty-four acres surrounded by a concrete wall, 33½ feet high, 14 inches thick at the top and 24 inches thick at the ground. Within this compound is to be a series of eight circular cell houses similar to the one now occupied by the inmates who are doing all of the construction work. These cell houses radiate in a circle from a central dining hall, each connected with the central building, which also is circular, by covered passageways. Simlar inclosed avenues will connect the first of a series of cell houses with the administration building. Power houses, store houses, a special cell house—corresponding to the present "solitary"—are detached from the cell house group. There will be only one gate to the compound. The dining room will seat approximately the entire population of the new prison—more than 2,000—at one time; the men will be served by the cafeteria system, another new idea for prisons.

CLEAN, AIRY AS AVIARY

The circular cell house, the heart of this whole new system for reconstruction of human waste material, gives one the impression upon first entrance of being in aviary, so light, clean and airy is it. It is built of concrete and faced brick, with cork insulation in the walls. In order to provide ninety minutes of sunshine to every cell and yet permit the smallest possible glass roof for economy in heating, Forrest R. Moulton, professor of astronomy at the University of Chicago, plotted a curve for a skylight, with two lateral north and south slots, that would admit the ninety minutes of sunshine every day of the year. That, in itself, according to Albert Moore Saxe, of the architectural firm, was a scientific feat.

The 248 cells are all alike. At present more than 300 men are housed in the new cell house with double deck beds, but this is a temporary arrangement to provide labor for the work in hand. The cells are 6 feet 6 inches wide by 10 feet 3 inches long and 8 feet high, giving five times the air space of the old rectangular cells. In the old prisons only here and there a cell has an outside window. In the new cell house every one has a window almost half as large as the end of the cell.

GOOD-BY TO THE WATER BUCKET

Another radical departure is the inclusion in each cell of a toilet and wash bowl with running water, hot and cold. This, Mr. Saxe explained, increases the hygienic value of the cells 1,000 per cent. The heating and ventilating arrangements are separate. Even if a man closes his window tightly, fresh air is literally forced down his throat by the ventilating system.

In the center of the house is a tower, surrounded by open space. Here the guards stand watch. Outside the building is a succession of brilliant opal electric lights which throw every window into strong relief at night so that

the guard may see from his position in the center any movement in front of any window. The doors of the cells are double locked. That is, they swing to and are locked automatically by the guard in the center with his hydraulic oil control; then another guard makes the rounds and with a key sets another lock. Any one of the cells may be opened independently of the others.

The wall that will encircle the prison, one-fourth of which is now in place, is being poured into molds. A section of it was standing at the time of the recent tornado which struck the district and although the storm wrecked houses and destroyed other property in the vicinity, this wall, which received the full effect of the devastating winds, suffered not even a scratch.

ENDORSEMENTS OF THE PAROLE LAW

Note: It has been the policy of the Division of Pardons and Paroles in its administration of the parole law of the state of Illinois, to co-operate with the committing authorities of the various counties of the state. Prior to the present administration no effort was made by those entrusted with the administration of this law to keep in touch with the judges and state's attorneys and invite their co-operation. As a result, at the various meetings of the State's Attorneys' Association of Illinois resolutions were adopted condemning the parole law and asking for its repeal. Former State's Attorney Maclay Hoyne of Cook county was especially severe in his condemnation of the law and its administration. He charged against this law all the crimes committed in the city of Chicago. He made it appear that the few hundred men on parole in that city were committing the thousands of crimes and the grand juries, under his direction, had repeatedly passed condemnatory resolutions. An investigation, however, revealed the fact that out of one thousand true bills found by the grand juries of that county, only nine were against men on parole from the Illinois state penal institutions.

ILLINOIS STATE'S ATTORNEYS' ASSOCIATION IN 1919

The State's Attorneys' Association of Illinois, in annual convention assembled, having had under consideration the parole act of Illinois, declare:

First—That the records of the three penal institutions—Joliet—Chester—Pontiac—together with the records of the Division of Pardons and Paroles, disclose, under the operation of said act, a remarkably small percentage of paroled persons, who have, while on parole, been charged with the commission of new and other offenses, and sentenced thereunder to return.

Second—That the purpose and spirit of said act is wholesome and good, and its administration, as now conducted, has been, and is producing excellent results.

Be it Therefore Resolved, By the association that the said parole act, be and the same is hereby endorsed and approved—and,

Be it Further Resolved, That the administration of said act, under the direction and supervision of Will Colvin, Superintendent of Pardons and Paroles, and his associates, John L. Whitman, Superintendent of Prisons, and James E. McClure, Assistant Director, be and the same is, most heartily approved, and,

Be it Further Resolved, That this association will co-operate, in the fullest measure possible, with said administrative officials, in carrying on this important work.

ILLINOIS STATE'S ATTORNEYS' ASSOCIATION IN 1920

Note: At the annual meeting of the Illinois State's Attorneys' Association held in the city of Chicago, December 29-30, 1920, the association again went on record as endorsing the parole law and its present administration by the adoption of the following:

The State's Attorneys' Association, in annual convention assembled, having had under consideration the parole act of Illinois and its administration, reaffirm the faith of this association in said act and in its adminstration, as declared in resolutions adopted by this association in its annual session at Decatur in December, 1919.

We realize that there are criticisms of the said act and of its administration but we declare that such criticisms are not based on the record and while we thoroughly understand that a paroled person may again violate the law, the records show that the percentage of such violations is so remarkably small that the act and its administration, by the officials in charge thereof, deserves the commendation and approval of this association and the same is hereby given.

CHICAGO CRIME COMMISSION

Note: Because of the crime condition in the city of Chicago, the Chicago Association of Commerce organized the Chicago Crime Commission. The object of this commission is the study of the crime situation in that city for the purpose of co-operating with the police department and the prosecuting officials and the distribution of correct information on all phases of the crime problem, with the end in view of suggesting amendments to and methods of enforcing the criminal laws.

The commission employed Henry Barrett Chamberlin as operating director. Because of the attitude of the then state's attorney of Cook county, and of some of the newspapers of that city, the crime commission, early in its existence, began an investigation of the administration of the Illinois state parole law by the Division of Pardons and Paroles. Mr. Chamberlin and officials and members of the crime commission attended meetings of the division sitting as a parole board at the Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet, and the Illinois State Reformatory at Pontiac. Mr. Chamberlin was also assigned to attend a meeting of the division at the Southern Illinois Penitentiary at Menard. The result of this investigation and of other observation of the operation of the parole law as at present administered, has brought frequent commendation.

In the crime commission's bulletin of January 10, 1919, will be found the following report:

Your committee on punishment and parole reports that at various times members of this committee, in company with the operating director, have attended meetings of the Division of Pardons and Paroles at Springfield and Joliet, and that the operating director alone was instructed to attend a session at Menard. The hearing of the Earl Dear case was attended by the operating director as the representative of the Chicago Crime Commission. The application for pardons or commutation of sentences in the cases of two murderers serving life sentences and two rapists serving fourteen year sentences were opposed formally by the vice-chairman and operating director on November 19, 1919. These cases, all of them with records of the greatest brutality, were being urged for favorable consideration by the friends of the prisoners and entirely ignored by representatives of prosecuting authorities. The commission, because of its information concerning these cases, was enabled to present illuminating data for consideration of the Division of Pardons and Paroles, with the result that recommendations were made to the governor that the petitions be not granted, recommendations in which the executive concurred.

It is the belief of this committee that the present personnel of the division is beyond reproach and that their decisions are made after the gravest deliberation and for the best interests of society. That much of the condemnation applied to the parole system is unjust and is confused with the term "probation." Paroles are granted only after a man has served his minimum sentence; whereas, probation is an act within the discretion of the court and was designed to protect the chance or first offender from the degradation of the felon's stripe. As it is now applied it is a farce. Men with criminal records, gunmen and old offenders are the beneficiaries of this law. Probation is not within the scope of this committee, rightfully coming under the observation of the committee on courts, and is merely mentioned to differentiate as between probation and parole in order that it may be understood that parole is many times quoted when the term "probation" should be used.

CONSCIENTIOUS WORK

Note: At the twelfth annual meeting of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology held at Indianapolis, September 17, 1920, Henry Barrett Chamberlin, operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission, read a paper bearing upon the accomplishments of the commission. In this paper Mr. Chamberlin paid the following tribute to the administration of the Illinois state parole law.

The commission has given considerable attention to the administration of the parole law. Much, in fact most of the criticism of this law is due to one of two things: i. e., the convicts released under the administration of the state board of pardons which went out of existence in 1917 with the passage of the administrative code, or, confusion of the terms "parole" and "proba-

tion." The press constantly uses the word "parole" when "probation" is meant. The police, the jurists and lawyers invariably confuse the terms, to the detriment of parole. An analysis of the various Cook county jury reports decrying the great number of paroled men brought before them usually develops that they are paroled from other states or are on probation. "Parole" is the term applied to the convict who has served at least the minimum of his indeterminate prison or reformatory sentence. The date of hearing is set considerably in advance by the Division of Pardons and Paroles.

Anyone interested in the case, either for or against, is notified and may appear at each hearing. The commission has filed its objection to the release of numerous prisoners. Representatives of the commission have attended sessions of the Division of Pardons and Paroles. In every case contested by the commission parole or commutation of sentence has been denied. The work of the board has been observed in cases where the commission has no especial interest and wherever cause was shown why the applicant should not be released from custody the petition was denied.

Those who advocate the repeal of the parole law should remember that all of the inmates of Joliet, Chester and Pontiac are not Chicago gunmen. There are men there for stealing a few chickens; for making an inadvertent remark, as one iceman did in East St. Louis during the race riot when in response to a query to the effect of "did you kill any negroes?"—he replied, "Yes! I got 'em here on ice"—or words to that effect; for many things from down state which would be a misdemeanor in Chicago and suffer no more than a fine or a few days in the county jail or house of correction.

These people should not be denied the opportunity to return to society and make good under the guidance of the parole officer.

If all of our public servants functioned as conscientiously as the present Division of Pardons and Paroles there would be no need for the continued existence of the Chicago Crime Commission.

OPEN LETTERS TO ILLINOIS STATE'S ATTORNEYS

Note: At the time the annual 1920 meeting of the Illinois State's Attorneys' Association was holding its sessions in the city of Chicago on December 29-30, certain Chicago newspapers were engaged in propaganda, seeking the suspension of the operation of the parole law. Articles were published by them misquoting members of the association. The association passed resolutions endorsing the parole law without a dissenting vote. In line with these misrepresentations a telegram was sent to down-state newspapers. Because of this it was thought advisable to address an open letter to all of the state's attorneys in the state of Illinois in order that those who were not present might be advised of the facts. It may be seen from the letter which follows that the quotations were without warrant and erroneous.

January 5, 1920.

To the State's Attorneys of Illinois:

Gentlemen: The members of the Division of Pardons and Paroles regret it is necessary to take this means of correcting newspaper accounts of what took place at the annual meeting in Chicago, on December 29th and 30th, of the Illinois State's Attorneys' Association, but the harm to the public welfare is so great that we feel the state's attorneys, who were not present at the annual meeting, should be correctly acquainted with the facts.

On Wednesday afternoon, December 29th, one of the press associations sent a dispatch from Chicago to its down-state papers that has done great harm throughout the state. As printed in an afternoon newspaper at Springfield, the text of this dispatch was as follows:

ATTORNEYS FOR SUSPENSION OF STATE PAROLE

(By International News Service.)

Chicago, December 29.—Almost unanimous approval of a state law providing for suspension of parole in Chicago and other cities in Illinois, life imprisonment for bandits who pursue the practice of armed raids and reports of a marked increase in crime in the state, featured the session of the Illinois State's Attorneys' Association which met here today.

The state's attorneys almost without exception, reported increases in crime in practically every corner of Illinois during 1920 and declared the increase had not been confined entirely to the larger cities.

State's Attorney Charles P. Evans, of Decatur, told the association that paroling of known criminals who have records was one of the reasons for the crime increase. "This is an evil," he said, "because it does not reform them. I believe suspension of the parole law for awhile would be a very good thing."

Roy Cline, newly elected state's attorney of Champaign, told the gathering that much of crime in Champaign and other smaller Illinois cities was traceable directly to Chicago "crooks and bandits."

In a letter to the Division of Pardons and Paroles, under date of January 5, 1920, State's Attorney Evans, of Macon county, says:

"Mr. Jesse L. Deck has this day handed me your letter to him of the 3rd inst., in which you said that you had noticed a paragraph in one of the Chicago papers purporting to quote me as being opposed to the parole law.

"I desire to state to you that I was altogether misquoted. Mr. Clark, representing the Chicago Examiner, as I recall, was introduced to me by Mr. Lauder and asked me my opinion on the parole law. I stated to him that I was for the parole law because it was our experience and observation that fully 90 per cent of the prisoners

paroled made good. That is my position now. I am at a loss to understand how or why I should be misquoted unless he meant to deliberately misquote me.

"I desire to assure you that I shall be glad to aid the department at any and all times in their work with the convicts who may be sent from this county. I desire to assure you and your fellow members of the Division of Pardons and Paroles that it will be my pleasure to co-operate with you in any way possible with your work and you will feel free to command me at any time.

"Trusting that this brief statement will put me right as to my real position upon the parole law of this state, I am

Yours very truly."

At the time this dispatch was sent from Chicago the state's attorneys had not considered the parole law. On the second day of the annual session, the following resolution, which speaks for itself, was adopted by the association, without a dissenting vote:

"The State's Attorneys' Association, in annual convention assembled, having had under consideration the parole act of Illinois and its administration, reaffirm the faith of this association in said act and in its administration, as declared in resolutions adopted by this association in its annual session at Decatur, in December, 1919.

"We realize that there are criticisms of the said act and of its adminstration but we declare that such criticisms are not based on the record and while we thoroughly understand that a paroled person may again violate the law, the records show that the percentage of such violations is so remarkably small that the act and its administration, by the officials in charge thereof, deserves the commendation and approval of this association and the same is hereby given."

Misrepresentations in the public press do incalculable harm to the public welfare. The ordinary newspaper reporter knows nothing about the problems of parole, as they relate to the public welfare, and cares nothing about them. The efforts of conscientious men, who have devoted years of their lives to a study of criminal problems, can be destroyed in a day by an irresponsible reporter and there is no recourse.

Upwards of four years of co-operation between the state's attorneys of Illinois and the state paroling authorities has produced exceptional results.

It is the earnest desire of the members of the Division of Pardons and Paroles to continue to co-operate with every state's attorney, both old and new.

WILL COLVIN, Superintendent.

FIRST YEAR OF CO-OPERATION

BETWEEN CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT AND STATE PAROLING AUTHORITIES

Note: Although their problems were the same, that of best serving the public welfare, for more than twenty years the state paroling authorities and the department of police in the great city of Chicago never so much as met upon a common ground until two years ago. In January, 1919, the general superintendent of police and the state paroling authorities agreed upon a plan of co-operation. Most satisfactory results accompanied the first year of co-operation, as shown by the reports of Sergeant of Police Michael J. Hogan, and William Christy, assistant chief parole agent.

REPORT OF SERGEANT MICHAEL J. HOGAN

Chicago, Illinois,
February 6, 1920

Mr. Will Colvin, Superintendent,
Division of Pardons and Paroles,
Springfield, Illinois.

Sir: In complying with your request I am pleased to inform you, and through you the Division of Pardons and Paroles, that in my opinion the co-operation between the police department of the city of Chicago and the parole office of the Division of Pardons and Paroles in said city, is a great success.

General Superintendent of Police John J. Garrity, is satisfied with the results. Under this arrangement I can truthfully say that in any case where a mistake has been made or an injustice done to a paroled man, the superintendent of police has had the matter investigated immediately.

Captain P. D. Clarkson, chief parole agent, and William Christy, assistant chief parole agent, and their assistants, have co-operated with the police sergeants who are under me and who have been assigned to the parole office. This co-operation has extended to the department of police of the city of Chicago, in general.

In all cases where paroled men are arrested and taken to the bureau of identification, or otherwise held, we are at once notified and make a thorough investigation. If the arrest is only a "pick-up" we make explanation to the commanding officer and he directs the police under him to turn them over to us. This saves the paroled men from appearing in court. In cases where it appears that the men arrested are not respecting the conditions of their parole agreements, we recommend that they be turned over to Mr. Christy, together with a written report from the police and matter covering the facts surrounding the arrest. This report is forwarded by Mr. Christy to the members of your division.

As I indicated above, the results of this system have been very satisfactory. It has brought about a more harmonious feeling between the commanding officers, the detective sergeants and the police officers in general, and the parole officers. The police officers have been able to see the direct results that have been, and are being, obtained.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL J. HOGAN, Sergeant.

REPORT OF WILLIAM CHRISTY, ASSISTANT CHIEF PAROLE AGENT

Chicago, Illinois,
February 5, 1920

I have the honor of submitting the following report concerning the co-operation which has existed between the Chicago headquarters of the Divi-

sion of Pardons and Paroles and the police department of the city of Chicago during the past year:

It was with a great deal of anxiety, and at the same time some little uncertainty as to the results which would be attained, with which the announcement of a pledge of better co-operation on the part of the Chicago police department was received at this headquarters. This was due to the fact that previously there had been a practice on the part of some police officers and officials to look askance at the parole law, and to annoy paroled men when any crime was committed in the section of the city in which they were located. In a manner this might be attributed to the desire on the part of some police officers and officials to make records in "cleaning up" cases in their district.

However, under the agreement of co-operation which has been entered into between the Division of Pardons and Paroles and the Chicago police department a better feeling has been engendered, and this has brought benefits to both departments. Suspicions on the part of each concerning the work and motives of the other have given way to confidence, with the result that officers assigned to special work at the Chicago headquarters of the Division of Pardons and Paroles have been convinced of the real motives of the parole system and they have co-operated in a very satisfactory manner during the year this agreement has been in effect. Whereas, in the past there has been cause for complaint—alleged underhanded methods on the part of police to hamper men on parole—there is now a better feeling in evidence, because of a clearer understanding of the parole law and the work which the Division of Pardons and Paroles is doing in the enforcement of this.

The co-operative agreement has given the Chicago police department the fullest information concerning the efforts and progress of all men under parole in this territory, and has made it possible to secure this information from first hand sources. On the other hand, this co-operation has worked to the benefit of the Chicago headquarters of the Division of Pardons and Paroles in that the minds of police officers have been cleared from that element of suspicion so prevalent in the past and which was to a greater or lesser degree the cause of any friction which might have been manifested between the two departments.

The co-operation which has existed between the Chicago police department and the local headquarters of the Division of Pardons and Paroles during the past year has been most satisfactory in the main. Mutual assistance has been given to each by the other, with the promise a continuation of the present agreement will bring greater and greater results as time goes on.

It is with pardonable pride your attention is directed to the fact that whereas in the past with each "clean-up" in connection with a "crime-wave", the heaviest toll taken by the Chicago police department has been men paroled from the various state institutions, while in the "clean-up" during the past few months, during which more than 1,700 suspects were brought to precinct stations for questioning, not a single parolee was taken into custody. The record is the most illuminating in the experience of the Chicago headquarters of the Division of Pardons and Paroles.

This headquarters are anxious for a continuation of the co-operative agreement with the Chicago police department during the coming year and will bend its best energies to securing results which will be mutually beneficial.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM CHRISTY,
Assistant Chief Parole Agent.

DISTRICT HEADQUARTERS

1 CHICAGO
2 JOLIET
3 ROCK ISLAND
4 PONTIAC
5 LEWISTOWN
6 PARIS
7 SPRINGFIELD
8 E.St. LOUIS
9 Mt. VERNON
10 Mc LEANSBORO

DOWN STATE SURVEY

CRIME CONDITIONS IN 1920 COMPARED WITH FORMER YEARS

While Chicago has suffered from a carnival of crime, similar to that which swept through other larger cities of the country, a survey by the parole agents of the Division of Pardons and Paroles reveals that the larger cities of Illinois, outside of Chicago have suffered less from crime this year than in prior years.

In making this survey chiefs of police in the larger cities, sheriffs and state's attorneys were interviewed as to conditions in their localities.

It is perculiarly noted that in the larger cities of the down state, such as Rock Island, Peoria, Springfield, East St. Louis and Decatur, in all of which crime has been less during the year 1920 than in former years, the closest co-operation is being had between the state parole authorities and the police departments. The above comparisons of the past year with former years were obtained from such chiefs of police as Thomas Cox of Rock Island, W. W. Rhoades of Peoria, William J. Mulconnery of East St. Louis, Wilbur Morris of Springfield, and E. G. Allen of Decatur, all men who have had many years of experience in their individual localities, and who are among the best known chiefs of police in the United States:

Briefly summarized here is what they say about the year 1920:

ROCK ISLAND DISTRICT NO. 3

Rock Island—Chief of Police Thomas Cox of the city of Rock Island, and Sheriff John G. Miller of Rock Island county both report that there has been less crime committed in the cities of Rock Island, Moline and East Moline than in previous years. In former years the numbers of prisoners held in the county jail of Rock Island county ranged from sixty to one hundred and twenty. During the past year the lowest number of prisoners in the county jail was on May 26, 1920, when there was seven. The highest number of prisoners confined in the county jail at one time was on September 22, 1920, when there was thirty-two. This is in a county with a population of 93,000.

Chief of Police Thomas Cox, who has the reputation of being one of the "best thief catchers" in the state of Illinois, reports that the total number of arrests made during the year was 1,336, a reduction of 373 cases from the record of 1919. Of this total number of arrests 486 were under state warrants for violation of the motor vehicle law; 112 were under city warrants for driving automobiles past street cars while receiving and discharging passengers; 44 were for violating the "dimmer" ordinance; two were for violating the "cut-out" ordinance; and one was for driving without lights. It will therefore be seen that 50 per cent of the total of 1,336 were for violation of the vehicle laws.

It is interesting to note in this connection that Mr. Cox's report points out that the record of arrests and convictions for the year 1920 was not only 373 less than the record of 1919 but 1618 less than the record of 1918 and 2467 less than the record of 1917.

Moline—Chief of Police Ben DeJaeger reports that crime has materially decreased during the past year in the city of Moline in Rock Island county. However, the year has been made exceptional by the commission of some sensational robberies. There was one daylight bank robbery, one attempted bank robbery, and one street car hold-up.

However, the number of arrests made during the year 1920 were considerably less than arrests made during the year 1919. As in Rock Island, the larger percentage of arrests were for violation of the vehicle traffic

laws. The number of arrests made for violating the speed limit law was 463, while 150 were charged with violating the auto light law.

Chief DeJaeger states that there has been a very material decrease in the amount of crime committed and that he is highly pleased with the results. He succeeded in apprehending not only those who attempted the bank hold-up but also those who succeeded in robbing the Commercial Bank of Moline. He likewise succeeded, through the assistance of Chief Thomas Cox of Rock Island, in arresting those who perpetrated the street car hold-up.

Chief DeJaeger is in deep sympathy with the state parole law and cooperates with the paroling authorities of this state.

East Moline—Chief of Police Thomas Schaffer of East Moline states that the year 1920 showed a very material decrease not only in the number of arrests made but in the number of crimes committed.

Galesburg—Chief of Police Fred Hinman of Galesburg reports that there has been a decrease in crime in the city of Galesburg, in Knox county.

Dixon—Chief of Police J. D. VanBebber of Dixon, in Lee county, reports that there is a material change for the better in criminal conditions in and about the city of Dixon.

Sheriff Frank Schoenholz of Lee county verifies this statement.

Sterling—Chief of Police John Haglock reports that crime conditions were considerably improved in 1920 over 1919 in and about Sterling and Rock Falls in Whiteside county.

Kewanee—Chief of Police John Ashly reports that the city of Kewanee, in Henry county, has been remarkably free from crime during the year 1920.

Monmouth—Sheriff Ira Hicks of Warren county reports that conditions existing in Monmouth and Warren country are very gratifying. It is believed that there has been a material reduction in crimes during the year 1920 over the year 1919.

DISTRICT NO. 1. OUTSIDE OF CHICAGO

Freeport—Chief of Police William Root of Freeport, in Stephenson county, believes that there has been a material decrease in the number of arrests made. He further says that the illicit manufacture and sale of liquor constitutes a large percentage of law violations in Freeport.

Sheriff Hayes of Stephenson county verifies this report.

Rockford—Chief of Police Bargen of the city of Rockford, in Winnebago county, reports 1400 more arrests in the year 1920 than in the year 1919. He states, however, that about eighty per cent of these arrests were for violation of the traffic and parking ordinances. Eliminating the violation of the vehicle traffic ordinance, the decrease in the year 1920 from 1919 is very material.

Sheriff Baldwin of Winnebago county reports a very marked decrease in the commission of crime in the county as a whole. He states that it is his belief that this is owing to a great degree to the decrease in population at Camp Grant.

Mt. Morris and Ogle County—Sheriff Banning reports a very material decrease in crime during 1920 as compared with 1919.

Belvidere—Chief of Police William Richardson of Belvidere reports that there has been but very little crime committed there during the past year.

State's Attorney Frank Oakley verifies the statement of Chief Richardson as to Belvidere and states that this applies to the entire county.

DeKalb—Sheriff Decker of DeKalb county states that there has been very little crime committed in the city of DeKalb and DeKalb county during the year 1920 and that it is less than the crime committed during the year 1919.

Wheaton—Sheriff Lienecke of DuPage county reports that Wheaton and DuPage county has been free from any sort of crime wave. He further states that there has been a decrease in the commission of misdemeanors and offenses of the lesser degree.

Elgin—Chief of Police Gehen of Elgin reports that only about one-half of the number of arrests were made in 1920 as were made in 1919. He attributes this to the fact that the members of his police force are able to "spot" the crooks who are driven out of Chicago.

The larger proportion of arrests in Elgin were for violation of the vehicle traffic laws and for stealing automobiles.

Aurora—Chief of Detectives Otto Wirz of Aurora likewise reports a decrease in the crimes committed in the city in 1920 as compared with 1919.

He also states that the bulk of arrests were for violation of the vehicle traffic laws and for stealing automobiles. About seventy-five per cent of the cars stolen in both Elgin and Aurora were recovered.

Sheriff Poole of Kane county, in which Elgin and Aurora are located, states that aside from arrests made for the illicit manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor, there has been a decrease in crime in the county as a whole.

Woodstock—Sheriff Wandrack of McHenry county states that there has been a decrease in crime in this county. The sheriff is opposed to the parole law.

PEORIA DISTRICT

Peoria—Peoria is one of the most populous of the down state centers. In a recent review of crime conditions published in a newspaper of that city, is an extended article under the heading "Sensationl Crime Wave Passed Peoria by in 1920". This article is based upon the police reports and points out that while there have been a number of major crimes committed in the city of Peoria during the past year, they do not exceed in number nor are they of a more serious character than have been perpetrated during the preceding years. The police department of that city, under the efficient leadership of its chief, W. W. Rhoades, felicitates itself upon the fact that while "Peoria has had a few murders and some robberies of its own, the miniature crime wave felt here is as naught compared with situations existing elsewhere.

Chief of Police W. W. Rhoades of the city of Peoria states that there has been a very marked decrease in the number of misdemeanors committed in that city in the year 1920 as compared with the year 1919. This, he says, is largely due to the abolition of the saloon. The number of arrests for drunkenness and disturbing the peace has greatly lessened. However, he believes there has been a slight increase in the number of major crimes committed. This statement is also verified by the sheriff's office of Peoria county.

Macomb—Sheriff E. L. Sapp of McDonough county reports that misdemeanors such as drunkenness and disturbing the peace are practically a thing of the past in this county, including the city of Macomb. He further reports that crimes of all kinds are gradually decreasing.

Bushnell—Officials report a decrease in crime.

LaHarpe—Officials report a decrease in crime.
Canton—Officials report a decrease in crime.
Farmington—Officials report a decrease in crime.
Lewistown—Officials report a decrease in crime.
Astoria—Officials report a decrease in crime.
Havana—Officials report a decrease in crime.
Rushville—Officials report a decrease in crime.

PONTIAC DISTRICT

Watseka—Hon. Elmer E. Taylor, who, in November 1920, was elected to the office of state's attorney of Iroquois county, in which Watseka is located, reports that he has not been closely enough in touch with the criminal records of the county to give a detailed statement. However, he is of the opinion that there has been no more crime during the year 1920 than in former years.

Mr. Taylor expressed himself as being strongly in favor of the parole law and offered to co-operate with the paroling authorities. He stated he will be glad to do everything in his power to assist in supervising and looking after such paroled men as were returned to his county.

Mr. Homer Brown, former sheriff of Iroquois county and now county treasurer, said there had been much less crime during the year 1920 than in former years. He further stated that none of the crime committed in his county was traceable to the influence of paroled men nor were any paroled men either directly or indirectly implicated in such crimes as had been committed.

Mr. Brown has been deeply interested in the parole law and has personally assisted in the supervision of men released upon parole from the Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet, as well as from the Southern Illinois Penitentiary at Chester. From his personal knowledge he states that such men as he has taken an interest in have all become law abiding citizens, respected in their community and have so lived as to reflect honor upon themselves and upon their families.

Sheriff George P. Hicks was out of the city when the parole agent called upon him. His office, however, reports that crime conditions were very much better than in former years. Petty gambling furnishes about the only trouble the authorities are having.

Bloomington—Chief of Police John J. Jones, of Bloomington, stated that with the exception of a few cases of gambling he had had no trouble in that city to speak of. There were several cases of burglary but it was found that these were committed by a local amateur. Since his apprehension they have had no further trouble.

Chief Jones declared himself as a friend of the parole law. He said that none of the crimes committed in Bloomington had been in any way connected with paroled men. He is of the opinion that the parole law should be administered with great care as to second offenders. In most cases he thinks they should not be paroled. He further expressed himself emphatically against political interference with the police department, saying that in his opinion much of the crime in the larger cites was traceable to police inefficiency, which, in turn, was due to the interference on the part of public officials higher up.

Hon. Homer Martin, recently elected state's attorney of McLean county, said that so far as the county is concerned he would have nothing to present to the next grand jury, unless crimes were committed between the date of his statement and the sitting of that body.

Mr. Martin expressed himself as deeply interested in the parole law and offered to co-operate in every way possible with the paroling authorities in the after care of such men as were returned to his county from the state correctional institutions.

Pontiac—Both Sheriff Gorman of Livingston county, and Chief of Police William Thornton of the city of Pontiac, report that they are having less trouble and that less crime has been committed during the past year than in previous years. The most trouble they have had has been due to the illicit manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor.

DANVILLE DISTRICT

Danville—Sheriff Charles Knox of Vermilion county states that in his opinion crime conditions in that county are much improved from what they were a year ago. However, he adds that there has been a slight increase during the last three months of the year 1920.

Champaign—Chief of Police A. U. Keller of the city of Champaign states that in his judgment there has been an increase in crime during the year 1920 over the preceding year. He also states that this is true of the vicinity. This increase has occurred during the latter part of the year.

Mattoon—Chief of Police Johnston states that in his opinion crime conditions in the city of Mattoon and in Coles county were no worse during the year 1920 than in the year 1919. If anything, he states, they are somewhat improved.

Sullivan—Sheriff Charles Lansden of Moultrie county reports that there is less crime in Sullivan and Moultrie county at the present time than there has been for the past two or three years.

Robinson—Judge J. C. Eagleton, one of the judges of the circuit bench of the circuit including Crawford county, says: "I am not only greatly in favor of the parole law but also the probation from the bench. I have read a great deal in the Chicago papers concerning the commission of crimes by ex-convicts. As a circuit judge I seldom have an ex-convict who has been paroled before me and it is my experience that as a rule, crime is not being committed by men who have been paroled from the penal institutions. I know personally of many men who have been reformed under the parole law. I also know of many who have been saved from penal institutions through bench probation. There are exceptions to all rules and there are doubtless exceptions to the parole law. It is probably true, also, that the paroling power may have been abused in some instances when second and third termers have been released too soon."

SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT

Springfield—Chief of Police Wilbur Morris, of the city of Springfield, reports that crime conditions in that city are much improved over preceding years.

Sheriff Henry Mester states that there has been less crime committed in Sangamon county during the year 1920 than in many previous years. He further states that this extends to the illicit sale of intoxicating liquors; the sales during the past year being much less than in former years since the city of Springfield went dry.

Sheriff Mester is of the opinion that the year 1921 bids fair to eclipse the record of 1920 in reduction of crime. He bases his opinion upon the tendency toward law observance on the part of the population.

Decatur—Chief of Police A. G. Allen, of Decatur, reports that in his opinion there was less crime committed during the year 1920 than in former years during his connection with the office.

Hon. C. F. Evans, state's attorney of Macon county, in which the city of Decatur is located, stated that there was less crime during the year 1920 than in any previous year within his experience.

Sheriff Mont Penniwell, of the same county, reports that in 1920 crime committed within the county was less than in any other year during his term of office.

Scott County—Sheriff Haskell of Scott county reports that there has been no more crime during the past year according to the records of his office, than during any other year since he has been sheriff of the county. State's Attorney Mehroff likewise reports that there is "no crime to speak of".

Morgan County—State's Attorney Robinson of Morgan county reports for Jacksonville and the remainder of the county, that he doubts if there has been as much crime during the past year as during the several previous years of his administration of that office. This report is also borne out by Sheriff Weatherford. Mr. Weatherford states that their chief trouble has been with the illicit manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor.

Jersey County—State's Attorney Hamilton of Jersey county reports that there has been less crime during the past year than in previous years of his administration.

EAST ST. LOUIS DISTRICT

East St. Louis—St. Clair county is one of the most populous of the down state counties. East St. Louis is one of the largest centers. Its population is supported in a great measure by its manufacturing industries. Chief of Police William J. Mulconnery, who has made an enviable record, reports that while most of the factories are closed down and those that are operating are working but half time, the crime record has not exceeded that of previous years, except in the matter of juvenile offenders which somewhat exceeds former years. In his report he states that of the large number of

men who were on parole in the city of East St. Louis, none had been arrested during the year 1920 and up to the date of this report, January 6, 1921.

Alton—Chief of Police Peter Fitzgerald of Alton, reports that while there is a slight increase in crime it is due largely to the illicit manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor. According to his report there is no appreciable increase in the major offenses against the law.

Chief Fitzgerald reports that one man on parole was arrested during the year. This parolee violated his parole by leaving the state. When he returned he was placed under arrest and returned to the institution at Chester for a hearing.

Granite City—Chief of Police Roy B. Clark of Granite City, Madison county, reports that there has been an excess of robbery while armed with a dangerous weapon and of house burglaries, but that other crime conditions are normal. He reports further that the paroled men in his city had given no trouble and that none of them had been implicated in the commission of crimes during the year 1920 and up to the date of his report, January 5, 1921. Granite City is also largely an industrial center. It, too, has been affected by the closing down of its factories.

MT. VERNON DISTRICT

Flora—Chief of Police Tatman states that one man can easily handle the police work now when formerly, before the abolishment of the saloon, it required three men.

He is heartily in favor of the parole law and states that though they have a number paroled from Pontiac he has never been given any trouble by them.

Albion—State's Attorney Allen E. Walker of Edwards county states that they do not have the heavy criminal docket now that they had in former years.

Sheriff Clyde Roosevelt bears out this statement and says it is his belief that crime is less than in former years.

Murphysboro—State's Attorney John H. Searing of Jackson county states that he has just been elected and is not familiar with the records of the office and therefore cannot give a statement as to whether crime has increased or not. He says that they always had a rather heavy criminal docket but it is not his belief that it is heavier now than in former years.

Sheriff James W. Gibson states that he cannot see much difference in the crime situation in Jackson county as compared with former years.

He states that he is in favor of the parole law but that there should be some restriction placed upon repeated offenders.

Chief of Police Otis Caywood of Murphysboro, states that the crime situation is about the same as in former years except that they do not have as many disturbances of the peace and murders as they had before the saloons were abrogated.

Mt. Vernon—State's Attorney Frank G. Thompson of Jefferson county states that the docket is heavier this year owing to the large number of automobile cases.

He expressed himself in favor of the parole law and believes that it should be administered with restrictions as to repeated offenders.

Chief of Police George Taylor of Mt. Vernon states that crime seems to be on the increase; that the criminals of larger centers have been driven into the smaller towns; that some of the crooks of the larger cities have paid Mt. Vernon a visit while passing through.

Note: The statement of Chief Taylor is probably influenced by the mail robbery which occurred just before the report was made. Later, local men were apprehended for it and charged with this robbery.

Lawrenceville—State's Attorney O. W. Longnecker of Lawrence county states that they have had more petty crimes during the year 1920 than in former years but that these crimes have not been committed by ex-convicts.

He expresses himself as favoring the parole law, believing that care should be taken however, in paroling second and third termers.

The sheriff of Lawrence county, W. H. Stivers, states that crime is diminishing and that the criminal docket is not as large as in former years.

Chief of Police C. D. Staltz of Lawrenceville reports that there was less crime in 1920 than in former years.

Mr. Staltz states that he is heartily in favor of the parole law and that he knows more than one man who has made good and has been reclaimed.

Centralia—Chief of Police Irvin Kaelen of Centralia states that while they have had trouble during the year 1920, most of the cases were minor offenses such as petty larceny and breaking and entering box cars, and that the docket is not nearly as heavy as in former years when the saloons were running.

Salem—Chief of Police Mat Branson of Salem states that he is having no trouble with criminals and that he hardly ever makes an arrest.

State's Attorney Charles F. Dew of Marion county, in which Centralia and Salem are located, has newly been elected to office. He says he does not think the criminal docket is any heavier than in former years.

Mr. Dew expresses himself as favoring the parole law with restrictions as to second and third termers.

Waterloo—The Chief of Police of Waterloo states that he hardly ever makes an arrest.

State's Attorney Roy E. Gauen states that the criminal docket of Monroe county was much smaller in 1920 than in former years when the saloons were in operation.

The sheriff of Monroe county, Earnest W. Loehr, says that they have no crime wave locally and that the criminal docket is no heavier now than in former years. The crime wave that seems to have swept the country is due to unsettled conditions, in his opinion, brought about by the world war.

He says that he is in favor of the parole law but that it may be "overworked" in some cases.

DuQuoin—Chief of Police Antone Huelsman of DuQuoin, in Perry county, states that there was not as much crime in 1920 as in former years when the saloons were in operation.

State's Attorney Judson E. Harris has been newly elected in Perry county, but states that the criminal docket does not seem to be any heavier than in former years.

He favors the parole law administered with some restrictions as to hardened criminals.

Sheriff Thomas H. Thimming verifies the statement of the state's attorney. He thinks however, that there is some decrease in crime.

He expresses himself as in favor of the parole law.

Pinckneyville—Chief of Police John W. Keene of Pinckneyville, in Perry county, states that he seldom has an occasion to make an arrest now, but that when the saloons were running he was kept busy.

Chester—State's Attorney L. F. Hachman of Randolph county states that there seems to be little change in the criminal docket as compared with former years.

Sheriff James H. McGuire verifies the statement of the state's attorney.

Fairfield—State's Attorney Roscoe Forth of Wayne county states that the crime wave that seems to be raging through the country has not affected his county; that in fact the number of crimes committed has decreased.

Sheriff George H. Anderson states that crime is on the decline in Wayne county. However, he reports that there has been a considerable number of automobiles stolen. Both State's Attorney Forth and Sheriff Anderson express themselves as in favor of the parole law but that the administration should be restricted as to second and third termers.

Mt. Carmel—Chief of Police James Bunn states that they have had some crimes committed during the past two years in the way of box car robbery and that they have also had a murder or two. He states that none of these crimes were committed by ex-convicts or by men on parole. He further states that they have several on parole there who are all making good.

State's Attorney Ben H. Townsend states while the criminal docket seems to be on the increase during the year 1920, owing to several serious

crimes committed in the county, the crimes were due to local conditions.

He states that they have several parolees there and that they are all doing well; that the parole law is a fine thing and that he is in favor of it. He states however, that there should be some restrictions as to hardened criminals.

Sheriff John S. Rigg states that crime is on the increase and that he doesn't like the parole law—it is too easy for most of the young criminals.

Olney—State's Attorney S. C. Lewis of Richland county states that the crime wave has not struck that county as yet; that they do not have many criminal cases; that while they have some petty larceny cases they are not as numerous as in former years.

Sheriff Frank Craig of Richland county verifies the statement of the state's attorney. He states that he is in favor of the parole law and that the only trouble they have in his county is from bench probation. He further says that they seldom send anyone to the penitentiary from this county.

Nashville—State's Attorney H. H. House states that they had about as much crime in 1920 as in former years—probably a little more—but it is not the fault of the parole law, and the crimes are not all being committed by ex-convicts.

He believes the parole law is a good law and offers men who want to go straight, an opportunity to do so.

Sheriff Henry Klosterhoff states that the criminal docket in 1920 was just about as it was in former years.

He expresses himself in favor of the parole law but is not in favor of the parole of the second and third termer.

Carmi—Sheriff Charles D. Gibbs of White county states that there has been fewer arrests during the year 1920 than ever before.

Louisville—State's Attorney Tolliver of Clay county states that they have a very light criminal docket in Clay county. He further states that he has no objection to the parole law or its administration. He thinks if it is properly administered it is a good law.

Chief of Police Earl Landreth of Louisville states that they do not have as many crimes now as in former years owing to the fact that the saloon has been abolished.

McLEANSBORO DISTRICT

West Frankfort—Chief of Police C. K. Spires of West Frankfort, in Franklin county, reports that there is less crime in that city and fewer arrests made than in previous years. Franklin county is one of the largest coal producing counties in the state of Illinois. Coal mining is its chief industry. Its population is made up largely of foreign elements and colored people who are engaged in or about the mines. West Frankfort is located in the southern portion of the county not far from the line of Williamson county. Williamson county is also a large coal producing territory and is populated by practically the same elements that constitute the population of Franklin county.

More men are serving their parole in these two counties than in any other part of the state south of St. Clair county. The report states that during the past year there have been but three parole violations in these two counties. Two of these parolees violated their parole by leaving their place of employment and the county in which they were paroled. The third was returned to the Southern Illinois Penitentiary for violation of his parole agreement.

Marion—Sheriff Melvin Thaxton of Williamson county says that they have had fewer arrests during the year 1920 than for a number of years past. There has not been a paroled man in the Williamson county jail for a year.

State's Attorney Elos E. Duty says: "I was assistant state's attorney for several years and am now state's attorney. I have been watching the parole system and from my observations I believe it to be a good law and that the administration of it has been a success. During the past two years

I have given particular attention to parole matters and I am ready and willing to co-operate with the paroling authorities in any way I can to assist them in caring for the parolees."

Harrisburg—Sheriff John Cummins of Saline county says that they have had fewer arrests in that county in the year 1920 than for many years past.

He further states that the paroled men are giving them no trouble.

Cairo—Chief of Police Leslie L. Wilboum of Cairo in Alexander county, states that there has been no decided increase in arrests for the year 1920. He adds that there would have been fewer had it not been for the drive that has been made in the larger cities against criminals. This has forced them to leave the larger towns and they have paid Cairo a visit in passing through.

He further states that they have had no trouble from men on parole.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 061866957